DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 475 HE 014 492

AUTHOR Richards, Michael D.; Sherratt, Gerald R.
TITLE Institutional Advancement Strategies in Hard Times. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 81
CONTRACT 400-77-73
NOTE 55p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 ($4.00 members, $5.50 nonmembers).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alumni; College Administration; Cooperative Programs; Educational Finance; Educational History; *Financial Support; *Fund Raising; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Information Dissemination; *Marketing; Private Financial Support; Program Evaluation; *Public Relations; School Community Relationship; Standards; Student Recruitment; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS Alumni Relations; *Institutional Advancement

ABSTRACT

The historical role of institutional advancement and the specific activities and trends currently affecting it are reviewed, and four strategies for advancement programs are suggested. Institutional advancement includes alumni relations, fund-raising, public relations, internal and external communications, and government relations, and its dominant concern is financial support of higher education and the institution. Changes in the perception of advancement have occurred over the last decade, and it has emerged as an essential and professional segment of university administration. Additionally, there has been increased cooperation within and among institutions with regard to advancement functions. Diverse trends are cited that have resulted in heightened interest in the management of advancement and new emphasis on the process and outcomes of advancement. Strategies for advancement programs are as follows: effective management of an institution's assets; focusing on the prestige of the institution; educational marketing; and flexible management, an eclectic approach incorporating a concept of dynamic advancement and the selected application of management principles. Centrally managed, a strategy for advancement confronts four challenges: designing quality public relations programs; restructuring activities to involve the institution's many publics; redesigning fund-raising campaigns to be cost effective and to achieve optimum results within the constraints of competition, inflation, and tax laws; and coordinating objectives, program, resources, and contacts. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

Report 2 1981

Institutional Advancement Strategies in Hard Times

Michael D. Richards and Gerald R. Sherratt

ED207475

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE014 492

Institutional Advancement Strategies In Hard Times

Michael D. Richards and Gerald R. Sherratt

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2, 1981

Prepared by

ERIC®

Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University

Published by

AAHE

American Association for Higher Education

Cite as:
Richards, Michael D. and Sherratt, Gerald D. *Institutional Advancement Strategies in Hard Times*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. 400-77-0073. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department.

Contents

1	**Overview**
3	**A Rationale for Institutional Advancement**
3	Operating Context: The Dynamics of a University
8	A Chronology of Institutional Advancement
14	**An Examination of the Advancement Umbrella**
14	Current Literature on Advancement
16	The Umbrella of Institutional Advancement
28	Trends in Institutional Advancement
37	**Strategies for Institutional Advancement**
37	The Present Climate
38	Four Strategies and Four Challenges for the Future
42	**Bibliography**

Foreword

The activities involved in institutional advancement have long been part of higher education institutions. However, in the past decade, several changes have occurred that make these activities much more critical to the well being of the institution. Some of the more significant changes are:

Student body characteristics: Institutions have traditionally depended upon their graduates for general financial support and endowment income. While the tremendous increase in enrollments would indicate a greater likelihood of alumni support, the increased number of part-time and lower-income students might signify otherwise. At a minimum, this new type of student will need more attention by college officials in order to create institutional loyalty.

Tuition levels: Institutions have always sought to keep their tuition down by seeking alternative funding. Today, however, inflation is eating up individuals' disposable income, leaving less available for higher education. Therefore, an institution's dependence upon this funding is even greater.

Decreased public confidence: Public support for higher education has decreased considerably over the past decade for several reasons. First, the student disturbances of the late 1960s created a negative image that has been very hard to erase. Second, the mystique of a college education has been eroded as a larger segment of the population goes on to college. Third, higher education has failed to articulate clearly what it can and cannot do and therefore has failed to counteract the misperceptions that society has concerning what should be expected from a college education.

Increased dependency on public support: Higher education institutions have become more and more dependent on support from local, state, and federal governments. In 1959-60 public support made up a little over 30 percent of total institutional income; by the mid-'70s this averaged nearly 50 percent (64.5 percent for public institutions, 22.6 percent for independent institutions). With increased public support came the need for accountability and regulation. Increasingly, this institution-government relationship has demanded more and more attention from administrators.

For these reasons the activities of institutional advancement—alumni relations, fund raising, public relations, internal and external communications, and government relations—have begun to play a significant role in the management of higher education institutions. In this research report, Michael D. Richards, director of alumni relations, and Gerald Sherratt, vice president for university relations at Utah State University, carefully examine the historical role of institutional advancement and then review specific activities and trends currently affecting it. In their concluding chapter, they present four stategies and four challenges that will prove to be of great value to individuals concerned with the future of institutional advancement at their institutions.

Jonathan D. Fife
Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University

Overview

From current research and literature about institutional advancement, this monograph reviews the state of an art—interpreting a university to its various publics. Institutional advancement (which includes alumni relations, fund raising, public relations, internal and external communications, and government relations) refers to a synchronized and total program to advance the understanding and support of a college or university. Its dominant concern is resources: acquiring, interpreting, and maintaining them as an aid to the institution in particular and to higher education in general. Although it was regarded with suspicion in the past, institutional advancement has become fundamental to managing higher education in the '80s.

American educators have long understood the need for cultivating public understanding and support for the nation's colleges and universities. Social and economic hard times particularly influence public opinion about higher education, increasing the need for university administrators to interpret the priorities and needs, values and opportunities of higher learning to the public.

Although its functions date to the beginning of higher education in America, the modern form of advancement began in 1958. Advancement officers spent the next dozen years explaining campus unrest and other issues to a public whose confidence in academic credibility was declining. The '70s required more explaining along with their own crises of confidence and lack of resources.

Until the last decade, advancement was on the fringes of academia, primarily involved with fund raising and publicity for the campus. For many faculty members and administrators, advancement meant huckstering, tub-thumping ballyhoo, and creative deception. In recent years perceptions have changed, and institutional advancement has emerged as an intensive, essential, and professional segment of university administration. Through necessity, institutional advancement has "arrived" on campus.

Every college and university in the nation has some type of advancement function. Each has adopted methods for interpreting its programs, activities, and institutional goals to alumni, students, future students, foundations, government agencies, and the general public. Advancement of higher education has become a profession with a national association and a record of effectiveness.

Research in the developing literature of advancement reveals a variety of ideas, concepts, programs, and issues about advancement's five generally accepted elements. Part of the disregard for advancement in the past has been confusion and misunderstanding over these specialties and their interdependence. Whereas these elements and perhaps other advancement programs they subsume (such as student recruitment and special events) once functioned independently, there is an increasing trend toward centralized management. Documenting this trend, as well as the role that institutional advancement plays on campus, is a growing body of knowledge that includes the descriptive and analytic. Much of the lit-

erature addresses the integration of the various advancement programs and their potential.

The expanding role of advancement and its specialties has brought about a number of changes affecting their management. Among these changes is an increase in cooperation within and among institutions rather than a reliance on uneven, fractionalized activities. Interest in integrating advancement programs has revived the role of the president as the advancement catalyst, expanding his or her responsibilities and leadership.

External pressures—declining enrollments and economic hard times—have generated new respectability for educational marketing as a component of an overall advancement program. At the same time, evaluation and research have enhanced the operation of advancement with the application of measurement techniques and the assessment of its effectiveness. These trends have resulted in heightened interest in the management of advancement and in an increased desire among practitioners for greater professionalism and standards of action. The diversity of these trends has placed new emphasis on the process and outcomes of advancement, creating a surge in activity that reflects concern for the future of higher education.

The final section of the monograph suggests four strategies for advancement programs, each of which depends on enlightened presidential leadership. The first, a resources approach, focuses on effective management of an institution's assets, both tangible and intangible, consistent with present day management techniques. This approach has several limitations, including its unlikely acceptance in toto among campus constituencies. The second strategy, which stresses the prestige of the institution, can provide another focus for advancement programs. This approach could be a principal factor in the interpretation of an institution to its publics. The third strategy is a marketing approach, which warrants close consideration in the competitive environment of higher education. The fourth strategy, called "flexible management," is an eclectic approach incorporating a concept of dynamic advancement and the selected application of management principles.

Centrally managed, a strategy for advancement confronts four challenges: designing quality public relations programs that build influence and support; restructuring activities to involve the institution's many publics; redesigning fund raising campaigns to be cost effective and to achieve optimum results within the constraints of competition, inflation, and tax law; and coordinating objectives, program, resources, and contacts for maximum effectiveness.

In addition to identifying and discussing the literature of institutional advancement, the objective of this monograph is to dispel confusion and misunderstanding about advancement by providing specific information and analysis for practitioners. We suggest that presidents and faculty members, as well as advancement professionals, can better manage their efforts with a clearer concept of advancement and its potential.

A Rationale For Institutional Advancement

Institutional advancement is a daily task of colleges and universities. In this country, and in an increasing number of foreign countries, colleges and universities are engaged in nurturing a climate for their advancement. Enrollment and financial forecasts for higher education in the next decade undoubtedly will place even greater responsibility on advancement programs as well as on new academic programs designed to meet the needs of the institution's various publics. Both independent and public colleges and universities must interpret themselves to their constituencies. Practitioners in higher education must understand the role institutional advancement plays in sustaining not only specific programs or functions of the university but the basic objectives of higher education as well.

By definition, institutional advancement (embracing alumni relations, fund raising, public relations, internal and external communications, and government relations) refers to a total program to foster understanding and support for a college or university (Muller 1977). Its dominant concern is the acquisition, interpretation, and maintenance of resources, particularly at a time of scarcity, as an aid to the institution. This study focuses not on the organization of institutional advancement functions, which may be as distinct as the nation's 3,000 colleges and universities themselves, but on the common principles upon which they operate. More often than not, the elements of institutional advancement are perceived as second-class university functions, peripheral to the overall mission. Such perceptions are counterproductive. At a time when public confidence in higher education is low and resources are scarce, advancement programs must be clearly understood and effectively implemented if the institution's objectives are to be fully realized.

Operating Context: The Dynamics of a University

The need for institutional advancement is based on the fundamental principle that America's colleges and universities must live in partnership with the public they serve. America's system of higher education has evolved in a pattern of nonprofit educational enterprises that compete with each other for intellectual and material resources. As Hesse sees it, higher education is a public trust:

> *It belongs to the people and its sole mission is to serve them. It exists because of the will and generosity of the populace. It derives its source of strength from mounting those programs that benefit the American public. It now bears the burden of educating young and old, rich and poor, black or white, by extending the knowledge of the world beyond present limits; and serving all areas of American life, be it business, industry, government, or leisure. But it can do all this only so long as it retains the confidence of the public and accepts responsibility, as a public trust, to act in the public interest. For the public to understand and remain supportive, it requires open disclosure of higher education's operations, a free flow of information to and from its constituent publics, a clearly identifiable set of goals and objectives, honest and*

frank exchange of views, and a constant interpretation of its priorities, needs, and functions. It needs to change with the times as much as it needs to retain and preserve that which works of the old and tried. It needs to accept the new requirements of a rapidly moving society as much as it needs to cherish the past. It needs to listen and attend to the guidance offered by many while leading boldly to achieve its own aspirations. In short, it must serve to blend and refine that which is best in our society in a continued effort to improve the quality of life and shape the way of the future (1973, p. 20).

Hesse's description of higher education's public responsibility is accepted by nearly all proponents of institutional advancement. The task of advancement, according to these proponents, is to create the climate of understanding and support that sustains higher education's public trust. In practice, institutional advancement has the responsibility, again in Hesse's words:

to honestly and in forthright fashion, inform, explain, and interpret [the university's] mission, functions, goals, objectives, and activities to those upon whom [the university] has come to depend. It cannot passively expect to earn the respect of the American people, it must actively work at defining and fulfilling its mission and seeing to it that its programs are clearly understood (1973, p. 20).

For obvious reasons the images, perspectives, and opinions of the public count; higher education has an obligation to be sensitive and responsive to them.

The public perspectives of higher education are generally comparable throughout the country. Schoenfeld (1954) identified 16 major points of view common to modern universities, and suggested that they might be used to evaluate a balanced advancement program. His list includes the perspectives of students, faculty, parents, trustees, and others. It is doubtful that a comprehensive list of public perspectives is possible. Perhaps more useful is a general understanding of public perspectives and the workings of institutional advancement.

The dynamics of a university involve the various components of the institution and their relationships to each other and to the university as a whole. The institution's dynamics provide its driving force and determine the degree of intensity and vitality of the university's thrust. Few elements of a university exist in isolation, and even components that seem antithetical to the primary purposes of the school contribute to the institution's dynamics. For example, the athletic program attracts media attention, which in turn may attract students to the college or university. The students and the added dollars they bring with them bolster the academic program. Thus even varsity sports or other ancillary activities of a university can help to strengthen the variety and quality of the university's classroom offerings.

Sixteen years ago, Laurence Veysey explained the success of the American university "as the product of a working combination of interests" (1965, p. 337). Perhaps foremost among those interests are the influences that have, in part, determined the nature of the country's educational institutions. For more than two centuries, the dominant influence on higher education in America was the English tradition of residential, liberal learning. In the 19th century, the German university with its emphasis on exactness in scholarship and research brought a second major influence to bear on American higher education. By the late 19th century, the American ideal of public service added a third dimension.

Katz and Kahn (1966) have suggested that universities, like other complex organizations, may be viewed as social organisms that respond to the inflow and outflow of components or, as Veysey claimed, "the working combination of interests." They note that as social systems, universities consist of "patterned activities" of both internal and external constituencies. Within that context, advancement adjusts and responds to new conditions or new combinations of interests that affect the operation of the institution.

The reality of ancillary functions. The various ancillary functions of colleges and universities—student services and associations, athletics, physical plant, vocational centers, publication services, and a variety of auxiliary centers—make up a significant "combination of interests" that add their own dimension to universities, at times competing with teaching, research, and service. These ancillary components influence policies and programs, and fill a legitimate position as elements of a university. The interaction among all these influences, as well as the issues they raise, contribute to the framework upon which an institutional advancement program is constructed.

The significance of the ancillary components is illustrated by the rise of intercollegiate athletics, most notably football, which had a profound impact on the expanding colleges and universities of the 19th century, an impact that continues today on many campuses. Rudolph assessed football as a

> *major instrument of publicity because both on and off the campus it was the sport that inspired the most enthusiasm, enlisted the most interest, and brought to the camp of college and university support people for whom the idea of going to college was out of the question, but for whom the idea of supporting the team was a matter of course (1962, p. 385).*

It has been argued that sports foster institutional solidarity, personal discipline among athletes, democratic ideals, and broad community support and thus receive the encouragement of administrators, students, alumni, and community members. Critics have argued that a university's business is teaching, research, and service, not sports. However, intercollegiate

athletics for both men and women have become a significant "patterned activity" for many colleges and universities and usually enjoy broad support from the public. Few advancement officers have not encountered the prospective donor who would rather support the university athletic program than the new chemistry annex or library, or who decides to support the academic programs because of the university's intercollegiate sports program.

The role of constituencies. Another development unique to American higher education is the continuing impact of the many constituencies of the university. A university is accountable to the general public as well as to students, trustees, faculty, staff, future students, alumni, parents, donors, government officials, and other interest groups. These people expect and are likely to receive specific responses from the university. The ways in which these constituencies perceive the university and influence its governance have become more and more important. Many universities have responded by reassessing the way they operate. Others have employed media campaigns to reach out and interpret themselves to their publics. Each constituency, one observer noted, has

> *a stake in the university's continued excellence: the alumni because the market value of their diplomas is based on the institution's present reputation, the current students for the same reason, the parents through loyalty for their children, friends because of what the university has meant to their relatives or acquaintances or to themselves, business and industrial firms because the institutions offer a market for their wares or a reservoir for future employees, the faculty because it provides their livelihood and/or the area of their professional achievements, and the local community because of the money it generates and the educational and entertainment program it sponsors (Sherratt 1975, pp. 138-9).*

To these one might add the stake of federal and state governments and of foundations that view higher education as a national resource and an instrument of social change.

The paradox of communication. A third development is the paradox of communication in a complex college or multiversity that needs effective internal methods of communicating with its loosely organized constituencies. Responding to the "stake" that constituencies have in the university requires communications. Yet, Veysey notes that a university thrives:

> *on the patterned isolation of its component parts, and this isolation [requires] that people continually talk past each other . . . This lack of comprehension, which safeguards one's privacy and one's illusions . . . may be of special importance in explaining otherwise unfathomable behavior of society's most intelligent members (1965, p. 338).*

Organized into many groups—divisions, schools, departments, research stations, administrative offices, alumni associations, student bodies, faculties, and other publics—these different levels of institutional accountability pose significant communication problems for the university. In terms of information sharing, each group has an essentially different status, and each needs accurate and rapid communication to make decisions. The occasional inability of the various university components to effectively communicate with each other is often a factor in isolating the divisions of the university and in circumscribing the dynamics of the institution.

A.W. Rowland wrote of practical challenges that justify advancement in an institution of higher learning:

> *The willingness of society, either narrowly conceived or broadly interpreted, to support higher education will be determined over the long run by how people feel about the institution, how well they understand its mission, to what extent they feel that it contributes to their total welfare, and ultimately, how deeply they are willing to dig down into their pocketbooks to support it. That is why institutional advancement is as important a function as any in a college or university, for in the final analysis, it makes the institution possible (1978, p. x).*

Rightly or wrongly, the present study assumes that each college and university operates in its own way, functions in a manner determined by its own pattern of expectations and by the activities characteristic of its constituencies.

This brief sketch of the context in which institutional advancement operates offers a basis for discussing and understanding the broad responsibility of all members of the campus community to advance the well-being of higher education. The university has a need to interpret itself to its publics, for the university obtains its support and reason for being from them. Institutional advancement begins with academic excellence, meaningful research programs, and practical public service; extends to the ancillary activities of the institution; and weds all the components together into a system. Institutional advancement is sometimes depicted as media hype or fiction. Rather, it is a coordinated program for the entire institution, involving secretaries, faculty members, administrators, and other professionals in an active strategy to strengthen the institution. "An institution's advancement program [is] not embodied in certain staff members and offices. Rather, the IAP is a concept, that must pervade the entire institutional family if the program is to be successful" (Leslie 1971, p. 56).

When a college dean speaks before a conference of national colleagues, both institutional and professional advancement occurs. When a department secretary answers the telephone pleasantly, institutional advancement is served. When a president presents an award to an illustrious alumnus, institutional advancement is at work. Proponents of advancement believe that both attitude and action influence individual institutions and higher education. Although institutional advancement must still battle

an occasional charge that it is flimflam, money-grubbing, or the glorification of the "fluff and bubble" of alma mater, it is more frequently perceived as a professional and vital part of higher education.

A Chronology of Institutional Advancement

One may gain a greater understanding of institutional advancement by tracing its development and its philosophy and programs and by highlighting important dates and events. Applying this chronological approach, three historical periods may be identified. The first period covers 1636 to 1900, the second period 1900 to 1958, and the third period 1958 to 1980.

First period: 1636-1900. Although the term "institutional advancement" is relatively new, its functions have been essential to universities since the 1630s when a young Harvard College began acquiring land, facilities, and students. During this period the college interpreted its objectives and methods to the public through action and by word-of-mouth. John Winthrop, governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, vividly documented the first reversal in Harvard's public relations and its far-reaching consequences. In 1639, at the beginning of Harvard's second term, Master Nathaniel Eaton, empowered by the community to preside over the college, erred by beating his assistant or "usher" with "a cudgel, which was a walnut tree plant, big enough to have killed a horse, and a yard in length. While two menservants held the wretched usher, Professor Eaton administered some two hundred blows about his head and shoulders during the space of two hours" (Morison 1935, p. 234). For his methods, Eaton was convicted of assault and dismissed from his position. "For almost a year after the dismissal of Eaton, Harvard College was in a state of suspended animation. Building operations went on slowly, but the College had neither master nor scholars" (Morison 1953, p. 241).

Over the years, Harvard was not the only institution with advancement problems. The young colonial colleges, facing trouble raising money for buildings and salaries, concentrated their efforts on patrons in England. Ellis (1884) documented the use of the first fund raising pamphlet, *New England's First Fruits*, published by the officers of Harvard. The tract, printed six years after Harvard's founding, described the offerings and goals of the college, and paid tribute to the beneficence of John Harvard. The content and format of *New England's First Fruits* provided an example that has been used over the years in countless money raising brochures throughout the country. Other colonial colleges made similar appeals, describing their offerings and objectives in solicitations to Great Britain. For nearly 100 years, until the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, the coffers of England frequently provided the resources colonial colleges needed. In later years during this period, colleges also received financial support from the religious denominations with which they were affiliated. As colleges opened in the West, officials sought revenues from patrons in the East. By 1900, tax revenues and philanthropists were providing large sums for the operation of many of the nation's colleges.

In addition to the problem of fund raising, early colleges had to cope at times with strained relationships among students, faculties, and communities. Davidson (1956) records numerous incidents during the period when colleges suffered significant public relations setbacks because they failed to interpret their objectives and methods to the public. Word-of-mouth, the principal form of communication early in the period, limited both the extent and the accuracy of information. Gradually catalogues, annual reports, and newspapers were used to advance the institution's point of view.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, newspapers criticized the colleges and universities for failure to meet the needs of society. During the years 1802-1828, student riots and the burning of college buildings were not uncommon. In a study of the reasons for these actions, Davidson concluded: "Most of the public relations problems . . . centered around the task of getting a college started, the ability of the curriculum to meet the needs of society, and the relationship of students and faculty to the local community" (Davidson 1956, p. 16).

In a pioneering effort to advance their institutions and improve communication, colleges and universities began organizing their alumni into a unified source of support, protection, and understanding (Maxwell 1965). The first organized alumni group is thought to be that of Williams College, established in 1821. Other colleges soon followed Williams' lead; by the end of the period nearly all major colleges had an alumni organization providing resources to the institution and services to their alumni.

Although the college or university president was the implicit leader of the institution's advancement during this period, the diverse components for the advancement of colleges had no clear central management. Each element functioned separately in its effort to advance understanding and support for the institution. Yet the foundation for an organized advancement program was in place by the end of the 19th century. College presidents became more interested in public relations as alumni, students, and others pressured colleges to meet their needs. By the turn of the century, the college public relations field had expanded, with new responsibilities and with broader recognition of its usefulness.

Second period: 1900-1958. Around 1900 a handful of college presidents, including Charles Van Hise at Wisconsin and Edmund James at Illinois, disregarded any undignified connotations of "publicity" to launch publicity programs to convey the campus scene to their constituencies. With few exceptions, however, the effort was gradual and haphazard. "College presidents who wanted help in developing 'press relations' called upon their secretaries, or eager undergraduate campus newspaper reporters, or staff members from their departments of journalism" (Seller 1962, p. 44). Too often the result was occasional and sporadic publicity, prone to subjective—even deceptive—stories of campus life. College publicity in its early years was principally a matter of projecting the name of the college into print through news stories of fraternity antics, athletic prowess, cu-

rious stunts, and campus oddities. Little attention was paid to academics, student excellence, or research. Rare, too, was a planned and coordinated strategy to cultivate the various publics of the college and to interpret the college to them.

Before the outbreak of World War I, secretaries of alumni associations organized the forerunner of the American Alumni Council (AAC), and a number of college publicists organized the American Association of College News Bureaus (AACNB) to share publicity ideas and to promote objective news of colleges as institutions (Reck 1976). Though success was largely dependent on the social and economic conditions of the time, broad publicity interest drew nearly 180 colleges to the AACNB by 1930. To encompass its changing interests and responsibilities, the AACNB changed its name to the American College Publicity Association and added to its philosophy the belief that respectable institutions should keep the public informed about academic affairs, educational programs, theories of professors, and worthwhile achievements of the student body. The publicity director became a creator of news ideas and an interpreter for the college since much of the advancement of the college centered on the institution's public relations. Spokesmen for the college addressed such issues as increasing public confidence, developing understanding and support for higher education, and interpreting the needs and values of higher education to society.

A broader concept of institutional advancement was adopted on most college campuses following World War II as improved techniques of communication, better evaluation of constituencies, and broader administrative responsibilities for college publicists enhanced advancement effectiveness. The enrollment boom of the period expanded the duties of college public relations, as colleges learned the value of well planned, effectively organized public relations functions. A broad base of informed and enthusiastic constituents offered numerous benefits to colleges and universities. Fund raising among independent colleges and universities that depended on public philanthropy assumed added importance. Moreover, technological and social changes required improved communication with the public on radio and in publications, and colleges were caught up in the effects of these changes.

Because of ever broadening responsibilities, the American College Publicity Association became the American College Public Relations Association (ACPRA), which accorded quasi-professional status to college public relations. ACPRA encouraged a scientific approach to public relations and communication. By the end of the period, it advocated close coordination of public relations elements at the policy making level of the institution. ACPRA provided the framework for college and university public relations practitioners to share ideas, coordinate activities, improve standards of practice, and seek solutions to emerging problems in advancement.

Third period: 1958-1980. Prior to the end of the second period, higher education experienced unprecedented growth and a parallel flourishing

of institutional advancement. Universities searched for guidelines in organizing public affairs programs, for fresh ideas in alumni relations and communication, and for more effective fund raising techniques. In 1958, professionals in public relations and higher education gathered at the Greenbrier Hotel in West Virginia to discuss the issues facing institutional advancement. The proceedings of the conference, known as the Greenbrier Report (American College Public Relations Association 1958) became the most significant advancement document of the decade.

Prior to the Greenbrier Report, most colleges and universities operated fragmented advancement programs. There were significant differences among institutions as to advancement (or development, as it was then called) definitions, objectives, organizations, performance, and staff titles. ACPRA's interviews and questionnaire studies, made during the two years prior to the conference, indicated a need for discussing administrative coordination of public relations' elements, clarifying organizational procedures, and developing more precise definitions for the various functions of institutional advancement. Although the report did not solve all the problems, the improvements it recommended were both important and practical.

Essentially, the Greenbrier Report was a comprehensive effort to define and improve the management of institutional advancement and its elements, as they were conceived in 1958. Conferees agreed that advancement programs existed in some form on each of their campuses and were growing in importance and responsibility. The report advised institutions to select an organizing pattern for their programs that would encourage coordination of all advancement functions and that would lighten the responsibilities of the president. The report recommended the appointment of an "administrative coordinator" at each institution who would work in harmony with the president to oversee alumni relations, fund raising, and public relations. Furthermore, the report outlined suggested purposes for each of these three elements to ensure that their programs and objectives reinforced what the report described as the salient goal of advancement: promoting public confidence in higher education. More explicitly than ever before, the Greenbrier conference provided institutional advancement with a set of guidelines and a written mandate to promote the understanding and support of higher education.

The American College Public Relations Association and the American Alumni Council encouraged other analyses of the advancement field. In 1969, ACPRA published a second major study focusing on the performance and management of development programs. Edited by John Leslie (1969), the study was one of several attempts (also A.W. Rowland 1956; Steinberg 1969), to apply quantitative research methodology to public relations and the advancement of higher education. The studies detailed the growth of higher education, identified where advancement programs, particularly fund raising, had significant impact, and assessed the techniques and productivity of advancement activities. However, despite the research most colleges and universities continued to rely on their fragmented ad-

vancement organizations and methods. Aside from the Greenbrier's recommendations for organizing advancement functions, it is likely that the findings of much of the analytical work had minimal effect. Resources were relatively plentiful, and by the mid-'60s university advancement staffs were preoccupied with explaining student unrest and alleged curricular irrelevancies to a public rapidly losing confidence in the value of higher education. However, the research produced important analyses of the institutional advancement field, documented its accomplishments and shortcomings, and suggested improvements and new directions.

During this period ACPRA and AAC worked to share ideas and raise standards of performance in institutional advancement, which later came to include fund raising. Since its founding in 1913, the American Alumni Council had served the needs of alumni directors and executive secretaries throughout the nation; it periodically correlated its activities and conferences with other professional associations. For university public relations professionals, ACPRA provided programs for professional improvement as well as a forum for airing current issues in higher education. From their beginnings the two groups had separate structures but overlapping purposes. ACPRA's journals, *Techniques* and *College and University Journal*, focused on ideas in public relations, alumni relations, and fund raising. AAC publications covered similar ground, although their focus was alumni relations. It became increasingly difficult to defend the uneconomical and splintering effort caused by this duplication of purposes for three reasons: (1) the membership of the associations were not efficiently served with four to five different publications and numerous conventions and district meetings; (2) the growing problem of financing higher education could no longer support two professional associations with parallel purposes; and (3) the splintered voice of institutional advancement added only confusion to the expanding role of the federal government in higher education. A unified organization advocating the advancement of higher education began to seem more effective.

In 1974, AAC and ACPRA merged into the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). During this period the term "institutional advancement" was generally accepted as the definition of a unified strategy and management structure for the central administration of advancement programs. Since the merger, CASE has expanded to serve more than 2,000 colleges and universities and 9,000 individuals in institutional advancement's major functional areas: alumni relations, fund raising, public relations, publications, periodicals, government relations, and the management of these functions.

In theory and practice, advancement has a role as essential as any other in the college or university. The concerns of advancement mirror those of the college or university: acquiring resources, interpreting aims and activities, maintaining traditions, fulfilling social responsibilities, and promoting higher learning. The fact that advancement can increase the institution's visibility and add to its resources contributes in vital ways to supporting the institution's mission. Over the past decades there has been

clarification of what advancement is, how its functions can best be organized and applied, and how it can best serve the immediate and future interests of higher education.

An Examination of the Advancement Umbrella

The current research and literature reveals a variety of ideas, concepts, programs, and issues on the state of the advancement art—interpreting a university to its various publics and gaining their support. Like the profession itself, however, the research and descriptive literature has been late developing. As Jacobson notes, "an applied field becomes rigorous in its execution only through time" (1977, p. 510). Prior to 1975, there were only a handful of philosophical or analytical treatments on institutional advancement. It seems the useful rigor of perspective and analysis in advancement studies is only beginning to emerge and will take more time to develop.

This section of the monograph reviews the recent scholarship on institutional advancement and then examines the status of advancement's elements, the functions that operate under its umbrella. The section concludes by identifying the emerging trends in advancement.

Current Literature on Advancement

Scholarly approaches to advancement include the descriptive and the analytic, which have guided practitioners and documented trends for the past 50 years. The principal motive for the descriptive studies has been to exchange ideas, experiences, and practices with officers in the various advancement functions. Persons (1946) and Reck (1946, 1948) suggested specific publicity techniques for college news bureaus, alumni staffs, and public relations offices. These publications were, in general, operating manuals with an absence of sustained analysis. A major section of Knowles' *Handbook of College and University Administration* (1970), as well as Bender and Wygal (1977), Kobre (1974), and the periodicals of the AAC, ACPRA, and CASE updated the descriptive literature with more ideas and information, describing current developments, case studies, and special programming.

In 1970, and updated in 1972, ACPRA published summaries of a variety of advancement programs, representing dozens of colleges and universities. Entitled the *Casebook of Institutional Advancement Programs* (1972), the collection focused on an array of advancement activities, providing "how-to" information for practitioners. The publications of ACPRA's successor, CASE, have continued the exchange of techniques, along with expanded features on the status, programs, and direction of all advancement functions. Issues of *CASE Currents* have featured reflective pieces on the state of higher education and on the management of institutional advancement. Occasional special issues highlight a particular theme, such as marketing, management of resources, student recruitment, communication, or annual giving. Articles on a specific theme sometimes have been published in book form for use by advancement practitioners.

Another resource guide is Reck's (1976) history of the college public relations movement, *The Changing World of College Public Relations*. This exhaustively documented study details the events, people, policies, and directions of the movement since its formal founding in 1917. Reck records what is perhaps the fundamental theme of the descriptive literature: that

public understanding and support for higher education rests on consistent, honest publicity and diverse programming for alumni and for the general public, programming that reflects the quality and spirit of individual institutions.

Schoenfeld (1954) proceeded beyond technique to explain the rationale of college publicity in terms of "sound administration" rather than appearances, addressing basic issues of college public relations. What should the institution be? What should the image of the institution be? What kinds of publicity and programs ought to reflect that image? The dual approach to advancement that has become generally accepted—educational integrity coupled with public goodwill—traces its philosophical beginnings to Schoenfeld's conclusion that American colleges and universities have one workable formula for success during economic hard times: "to conduct their affairs with such acumen that the time-tested values and objectives of broad and deep higher education will be served at the same time as the development and maintenance of the public interest, goodwill, and support" (1954, p. 3). Schoenfeld examined the avenues through which colleges and universities interpret themselves to their constituents, advocating an integrated public relations (advancement) policy including planning, communication, forecasting, programming, research, and future planning.

Other examples of this approach, not specifically directed toward college and university advancement, include Lesly (1971), Budd (1969), Cutlip and Center (1978), Seymour (1966), and the *Handbook of Public Relations* edited by Stephenson (1970), all well-known public relations and fund raising texts. These texts agree that deliberation and coordination at all levels is the best method for dealing with the various components of advancement in both nonprofit and profit making organizations.

Analytical approaches to institutional advancement have received attention in the works of Fine (1951), ACPRA (1958), Leslie (1969, 1971, 1973, 1978, 1979), Jacobson (1975, 1978b), and A.W. Rowland (1974, 1977). These studies examined trends in the advancement field, citing quantitative measures designed to show how various programs perform, in order to assist in better decision making and application of resources. Recent analytical literature shows increased attention to the empirical study of institutional advancement. There also seems to be a growing acceptance of the concept that institutional advancement leaders must "conceive, design, and implement an integrating function that serves the institution as a sensor of social change, articulator of the organization's conscience, communicator-counselor, and monitor of policies and programs as they relate to the public expectations" (Jacobson 1977, p. 521). An integrated resource for advancement practitioners and for students of advancement that reinforces this concept is A.W. Rowland's *Handbook of Institutional Advancement* (1977). This important contribution discusses all the functions of advancement programs with strong descriptive and analytical essays. Encyclopedic in scope, the handbook provides a wealth of practical information based on reasonable philosophical premises and examples of

the latest in advancement programming. Other resources germane to advancement are the works of Krachenberg (1972), Fram (1973), Kotler (1975), Barton (1978), Ihlanfeldt (1980), and Litten (1980), which represent attempts to explore and implement marketing principles and selected marketing strategies in higher education.

The most comprehensive examination of advancement issues is the Jossey-Bass series, *New Directions for Institutional Advancement*, under the general editorship of A. Westley Rowland. Published since 1978 the source books analyze the theories, innovations, practices, and evaluation methods that make up an integrated institutional advancement program. The series emphasizes empirical measures of advancement, application of empirical management techniques for enhanced program effectiveness, and more precise articulation of the purposes of advancement.

In summary, the bulk of scholarly literature on institutional advancement has emerged over the last decade, during which the profession of advancement has become indispensable to colleges and universities. Although much of the literature is descriptive, analytical studies have begun to emerge, reflecting a more rigorous approach to the field. The recent studies have focused on the philosophical basis of institutional advancement with in-depth examination of the issues and problems that have an impact on an institution's ability to interpret itself to diverse constituencies.

The Umbrella of Institutional Advancement

The elements of advancement are best managed under a single organizational umbrella. In the past these five elements have been handled as separate operations; only recently have they been gathered together for central administration. The areas illustrate the diversity of advancement directions and offer a fair idea of the magnitude and dimensions of the field.

Alumni relations. The chief audience of institutional advancement is the expanding network of former students who unite through a variety of programs to foster understanding and support for alma mater. Far from being just cheery football boosters, alumni can be earnest, attentive constituents whose services provide direct, long-term benefits to the institution. As evaluators of educational service, lasting resources for planning, and people with a vested interest, alumni are assets of profound significance (Dueitt 1975).

Alumni are a major audience of institutional advancement programs, one that colleges and universities cannot afford to neglect. External communications are planned to keep alumni informed about the institution. Fund raising directs a significant proportion of its energies toward alumni. Public relations campaigns attempt to generate a climate of responsive understanding among them. Since alumni contribute money, time, talent, and loyalty to their institutions, the attention given them is clearly justified. One observer has noted that alumni are "the most fertile and readily

identifiable source of continuing assistance" to colleges and universities (Muller 1977, p. 7).

Forman calls alumni support for the university the "vital margin," the measure of "additional support that a university needs to move beyond its present capabilities" (1979, p. 8). Upon effective alumni relations are predicated most of the other four institutional functions. Once involved and enlightened, alumni are the best interpreters of the institution to the general public and to special constituencies. Alumni perpetuate and protect their institutions "as institutional guardians, the safeguarders, even the watchdogs of the traditional quality and character of their university" (Forman 1980, p. 46). This alumni devotion, although overbearing or threatening at times, has yielded immeasurable benefits for individual institutions and for American higher education.

In past decades, alumni have provided continuing strength to their institutions. Total annual alumni giving to colleges and universities recently amounted to more than $620 million (Council for Financial Aid to Education 1980). Alumni also donate time, professional skills, organizational talents, and gifts in kind to advance their institutions.

Forecasts for the future of higher education make cultivating alumni relations all the more important. The financial and enrollment difficulties that colleges and universities experience during hard times require the extensive involvement of alumni. On many campuses, the use of alumni in the recruiting and admissions process has proven remarkably effective and successful. Alumni themselves are returning to college for more training and continuing education and have become an important nontraditional student market (Forman 1980, p. 49). In addition to enrolling, interpreting, and recruiting, alumni can provide help, according to Emerson (1979) and Radock (1980), in such areas as:

- working in job placement to provide counseling and placement for undergraduates;
- assisting in government relations to support state and federal programs and legislation that may benefit both institutions and higher education in general;
- sponsoring student-alumni seminars to nurture future alumni volunteers committed to and interested in the institution;
- serving as annual-giving volunteers to increase the institution's contacts with potential donors and to raise necessary funds for the institution's current operations;
- advising their institutions by providing vital feedback on how they were served by the curriculum, social climate, and intellectual atmosphere;
- defending the merits of higher education at times when public sentiment lacks confidence in the value of college education.

Current alumni programming at many colleges and universities provides assorted mechanisms for fostering these activities, each geared to

the character of the alumni body being served. Of course, the challenge is to sponsor purposeful activities, which requires creative and constructive management by college presidents and advancement staffs.

Thirty years ago, the potential of alumni as a university resource was thought virtually unlimited if: (1) the experiences during the undergraduate years were recalled with appreciation and pleasure; (2) the institution kept its alumni fully informed on its mission, progress, and problems; (3) alumni were assured of an institution that served them well and in which they could take continuing pride; (4) alumni clubs and associations did not become vested interests or ends in themselves; and (5) the institution provided opportunities for meaningful tasks on behalf or in support of their institutions (Reck 1946, p. 116). These factors are equally important today, and present demographic trends suggest that they will be all the more significant in the future. There are more adults on campus, more older alumni, more post-baby-boom clusters of young alumni, more single parents, more people of higher incomes with more leisure time, more minorities, and more working women (Seiple 1978, p. 17).

In addition to these trends, alumni administrators must consider the fact that today's alumni want meaningful activities. Concerned with more than football, alumni are interested in continuing education, in having their opinions heard in university policy making, in meeting and evaluating future students, in directing alumni programs to young alumni and nontraditional students, in staying informed about the progress of their institution, and in providing other services as needed.

In his study of alumni programs, Reichley notes that "if it is true that support follows involvement or that the two are inextricably linked, then alumni programs are the heart of the enterprise" (1977, p. 304). There are a great many programs that can be offered to involve all segments of the alumni network. Reunions, homecoming, founder's day, and similar nostalgia programs are just one facet of the range of activities designed to meet alumni interests. Alumni programs may include any of the following: continuing education workshops and seminars; recognition banquets for illustrious alumni; class, special interest group, or college reunions; receptions for the college president or for distinguished alumni; coaches'-corners either before or after athletic events; alumni colleges, weekend colleges, or family summer camps; seminars and banquets; job placement and counseling; alumni learning and leisure tours; club meetings for socializing or continuing education; scholarship programs; student admissions and recruitment; alumni records updating; state-of-the university dinners, cultural programs, including lectures and concerts; annual-giving drives; merchandising; young alumni and alumni-student activities; and alumni publications (Barcus 1968).

Although in the past the effectiveness of these programs was rarely studied, hard times have resulted in more careful use of resources and better program management, including methods of evaluation and survey research. The most widespread measure of the impact of alumni programs is the survey or questionnaire designed to study attitudes, participation

levels, image, and interests. Such surveys provide feedback on the progress of alumni programs, indicate the extent of interdependence with other advancement specialties, and record valuable information for long-range planning.

Lately, limited resources and pressures on decision making have made evaluation the only way to ensure that advancement provides the most effective services and programs (Jacobson 1975, 1978b). In 1974, ACPRA issued a special report on evaluation noting its importance in managing advancement programs and focusing on surveying alumni and community attitudes (Hesse 1974). Since then, the "Age of Accountability" has further emphasized evaluation as a tool for advancement managers. As to its current value, Jacobson has written: "evaluation is needed in good times and bad, but the present-day financial stringencies place new demands on successful adjustment strategies. Critics say that if the effects of advancement programs are truly positive and beneficial, directors of those programs should be able to prove it" (1978b, p. 6).

Efforts to develop better techniques for program evaluation have included projects by the National Conference on Measuring the Effectiveness of Public Relations (Grunig 1977), the evaluation models for assessing fund raising effectiveness developed by the Institute for Continuing Education of the National Society of Fund Raisers (Smallwood and Levis 1977), and the models for program assessment for institutions developed by Teitelbaum (1979). Leslie (various dates) has evaluated specific advancement trends and practices while refining measurement techniques in advancement. In his analysis of evaluation and related issues Jacobson (1977, 1978b) documented past survey research and suggested systematic steps for assessing advancement programs.

Fund raising. Among educational institutions, fund raising, or development, is defined as "the practice of soliciting gifts and grants for schools, colleges, and universities from interested individuals and organizations" (Cheshire 1977, p. 121). Its single purpose is to enhance the welfare of the institution, and it has become indispensable in recent hard times. Cheshire has explained that funds raised through private philanthropy "make possible a margin of educational difference" in both the public and the independent sectors of higher education. For many institutions, survival and academic quality hinge on contributed resources. "With the help of fund raising, institutions can afford to be better, more accessible, and more independent. Each of these qualities contributes to effectiveness of education and to the strength of society" (Cheshire 1977, p. 121).

Under the umbrella of institutional advancement fund raising manages solicitation programs based on the economic reality that colleges and universities are enterprises competing for scarce resources. High inflation rates and declining enrollments have caused traditional resources to dwindle, creating hardships for many institutions. Tuition, endowment income, and state and federal appropriations do not adequately cover expenses (Welch 1980). Voluntary support has made the difference. Some institu-

tions have needed to raise as much as 10 to 12 percent of their educational budgets; others have needed even more.

The benefits of fund raising in the past decade illustrate its growing importance and explain its increasing emphasis among institutions. The Council for Financial Aid to Education (1980) reports steady increases in total voluntary giving. Although a comparison of the figures by source with those of previous decades indicates that private philanthropy is not growing as fast as in previous years, the point remains that voluntary giving continues to provide a significant percentage of financial support for higher education. The details given in the table below show the amounts and percentages reported by colleges and universities responding to CFAE's questionnaires. Throughout the period from 1974 to 1979, individuals were the most significant source of voluntary support; they accounted for 46 to 48 percent of the total.

An effective fund raising program operates according to specific and generally accepted principles. G. T. Smith (1977) examines fund raising principles in managerial terms: planning, activities, resources, and evaluation. *Planning* involves establishing the purpose, principles, policies, and priorities for the giving program, consistent with the goals of the institution and coordinated with the mission of each division of the university. The *activities* include all forms of giving and gift cultivation. *Resources* for fund raising—staff, budget, volunteers, record keeping—require careful management, based on the institution's principal mission. *Evaluation* assesses the performance of fund raising in terms of the predetermined plan, the expectations of the campaign, and other variables. Not every fund raising program succeeds, and many fund raising counselors recommend setting realistic goals, developing careful plans, and following through with an evaluation of the campaign's efficiency (Cheshire 1977, Freyd 1980, Heeman 1979, G. Smith 1977, H. Smith 1979).

Voluntary Support For Higher Education by Source

(in millions of dollars)

Source	1974-75		1975-76		1976-77		1977-78		1978-79	
Alumni	$486	22.5%	$588	24.4%	$638	23.9%	$714	23.5%	$785	24.3%
Nonalumni individuals	516	23.8	569	23.6	646	24.2	766	25.2	736	22.8
Business corporations	497	23.0	549	22.8	558	20.9	623	20.5	701	21.7
Religious denominations	112	5.2	130	5.4	136	5.1	158	5.2	161	5.0
Other	192	8.9	195	8.1	246	9.2	271	8.9	291	9.0
All Sources	$2,160	100.0	$2,410	100.0	$2,670	100.0	$3,040	100.0	$3,230	100.0

Fund raisers in education solicit both individuals and organizations. Normally, individuals are canvassed through the following four giving categories.

Annual giving. The annual fund is conducted each year among alumni and friends of the university, and encourages giving to the "living endowment" of the institution. The income derived from annual giving has become an important part of the current operations budget of many institutions. The annual campaign has come a long way since Yale, the father of the annual fund, raised $11,000 in its 1890 drive. In 1978-79, annual giving's contribution to the total fund raising operation of the nation's colleges and universities totaled more than $620 million (Council for Financial Aid to Education 1980). The campaign has become highly sophisticated and encompasses a number of techniques such as mailings, phonathons, personal appeals, giving clubs, class agents, town and county solicitations, college and school campaigns, class reunions, gift programs, and memorial gift programs, among other aspects.

Major and special giving. This category embraces specialized campaigns, each with its own particular set of purposes and appeals, such as ad hoc campaigns to raise money for special projects (from endowed chairs to arboretums), and individual appeals for major donations.

Capital giving. Gifts or grants bestowed for the expansion or improvement of the physical plant—capital expenses—are commonly financed through capital giving. Institutions embark on a capital campaign when a new building is needed or when endowment funds for capital or academic projects need to be raised.

Deferred giving. Gifts and grants to a college or university whose direct benefits occur at some future date are known as deferred. Deferred gifts and grants are made in the form of annuities, bequests, charitable trusts, and life insurance, among others.

On some campuses these last three categories have been combined into one intensive "major campaign." The purpose of the major campaign strategy is to concentrate staff and media in a coordinated effort of intermediate duration (Cheshire 1979).

Financial support from organizations, particularly corporations and foundations (commonly solicited by written proposals for a funding project), has become significant since the 1950's when corporate leaders became outspoken advocates of higher education (Knowles 1978) chiefly to meet society's need for trained manpower. Foundations now account for the second largest percentage of voluntary support—after individuals. Corporations, religious denominations, and international and professional organizations also are major giving sources. Indeed, the extent of support from organizations has prompted colleges and universities that seek organization dollars to add specialists in foundation and corporate liaison to their fund raising staffs.

The Tax Reform Acts of 1969 and 1976 had a major influence on foundation support of higher education and other nonprofit organizations. The 1969 law was passed to correct alleged abuses in the area of private foun-

dations. By reclassifying charitable organizations as either public charities or private foundations according to specific criteria, Congress mandated restrictive provisions for the taxation and operation of foundations (DioGuardi 1980). The 1976 reforms, which revised the 1969 act, formulated additional rules to circumscribe the operations of foundations. The collective effect of these reforms appears responsible for the reduced growth in foundation giving over the past decade (H. Smith 1979). By restructuring estate taxation, the 1976 act particularly inhibited the attractiveness of giving. By the end of the decade, foundation philanthropy had been redefined, regulated, and, as a result of the Revenue Act of 1978, taxed with a two percent excise levy on new investment income.

While the prospects for voluntary giving depend largely on the future of public tax policy, the matter of fund raising productivity—dollars raised versus dollars spent—has become an important concept for advancement planning. The Filer Commission was the first to document the effects of private philanthropy; its 1975 report applied empirical data derived from extensive surveys and research. The report advocated public policy and tax incentives for continuing voluntary giving for public purposes. Among institutions of higher education the collection of empirical data on fund raising productivity has become an essential element for management and for formulating policy. Increasingly, advancement program managers need to know cost data.

In *Analyzing the Cost Effectiveness of Fund Raising*, Heeman (1979) reviews the variety of studies that have attempted to measure the efficiency of educational fund raising. Heeman's study argues for: (1) more precise definitions of cost indicators, (2) development of a coherent system for analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising programs, and (3) a willingness to share cost data nationally. Leslie's (1969) pioneering work on cost/benefits identified benchmarks for measuring efficiency. Institutions raising $1,000,000 or more each year spent less than 20 percent on the dollar; institutions raising $200,000 or less spent more than 60 percent. Several key variables for measuring productivity and potential—resource allocations for raising funds, percentage of the education and general budget that fund raising receives, and gift income profiles—have enabled institutions to develop specific cost and performance data (Leslie 1979). Findings in a detailed study conducted by the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (1976) provide organizational and expenditure data, as well as important analyses of giving profiles that further aid institutions. Some of the study's findings, when applied to a typical fund raising operation, highlight strengths and weaknesses that are useful in determining long-term advancement strategies. Of the COFHE's conclusions, Ramsden notes:

> *Some institutions were clearly underinvesting in the development function; some were obtaining a modest return on what they were investing; some deployed their resources in singular and not always understandable ways. . . . Finally, considering that almost half of all gifts from*

individuals are in the form of bequests or deferred gifts, few institutions appeared to be devoting sufficient resources to this endeavor, especially compared with the resources devoted to the obtaining of currently expendable gifts (1979, p. 32).

Fund raising has become more sophisticated and demands the efficient use of resources. Raising money continues to be a vital function of institutional advancement, requiring management attention to how the funds are raised, acknowledged, accounted for, and expended.

Public relations. The third institutional advancement element, public relations, or institutional relations as some call it, is a potpourri of responsibilities. Its operations include community relations, internal relations, media relations, publications and special events. It is an idea-generating and problem-solving office that serves as the hub of advancement activity on many campuses. Within its realm of responsibility, the public relations office has the objective of advancing understanding and support for the institution through programs designed to improve public confidence in the institution and to perform needed services.

Community relations activities address the obligation colleges and universities have to maintain a constructive rapport with local citizens. In a special issue of *CASE Currents* focusing on community relations, Winkler notes: "more and more colleges believe they should live for and with their communities, not just in them. They take major responsibility for organizing the best possible response to the area's pressing needs" (1978, p. 9).

The community relations programs are designed to reach out to the institution's various constituencies, to inform as well as to listen, to serve as well as to be of service. Knowles encouraged several community relations practices: "Representation of local citizenry on the institution's governing board and participation by faculty and staff in the community's government [is] essential to good public relations" (1978, p. 3414). Aikman has suggested other community relations techniques that practitioners can implement, such as offering: "the resources, people, and facilities of the institution to help solve community problems; sharing decision making with the community, creating opportunities (not in time of crises alone) for meetings between city leaders and campus chiefs" (1978, p. 46). Campus orientation days for local citizens, speakers bureaus, facilities planning meetings, student housing discussions—these have emerged as just a few of the ways colleges and universities are cultivating public acceptance and support of their educational objectives.

The public relations office also has a duty to cultivate good relations among faculty, students, staff, and administrators. At many institutions the public relations office has the task of managing credible internal relations with what Irving Shapiro, past chairman of the board of Dupont, has called an "organizational consciousness." Quoted in a *CASE Currents* special issue on internal communications he says:

At a minimum, people in an organization should know where the organization is headed, why it has chosen to go that way, and what their personal role in the new mission is to be. Their feelings about these three matters must be solicited and considered. They must have the opportunity to contribute to policy formulations, even though the eventual final decisions still rest with management. But their sense of participation and support is vital (Lockwood 1977, p. 13).

Many proponents of effective internal relations advocate the sharing of information among all on-campus constituencies, something more than just a weekly communication to employees. Whether through rap sessions with the president, faculty-student forums, socials, or the employee newsletter or magazine, the idea is to foster communication for improved morale and for institutional progress. An axiom of advancement is that effective internal relations are prerequisite to effective external relations.

As an ancillary function in most public relations offices, a special events office may or may not have a clear place on the college or university organization chart. Yet, in the past few years, the special events office has demonstrated its own particular, even vital function. Special events offer frequent opportunities to generate and reaffirm a favorable image. The excitement, ceremony, and tradition inherent in special events direct public attention to the campus as they convey to a large audience the spirit, uniqueness, and vitality of the institution. Of course, the purpose of special events is to attract the public eye to a positive awareness of the institution and its programs. When well planned and orchestrated, these become far more than pseudo-events, staged solely for media coverage. They capture the flavor of the institution and make a special appeal to the public and to the institution's various constituencies (Rydar 1977). By this means, special events become another dimension of an overall institutional advancement program.

Normally special events augment the yearly activities of the institution. Some of the activities may be sponsored by the alumni association, high school relations office, athletic staff, or other offices of the college or university. They include business seminars; fairs and festivals; inaugurations; building dedications; programs recognizing distinguished students, faculty, alumni, or community leaders; memorial concerts; open houses; ground breaking ceremonies; high school days; fund raising banquets; seasonal receptions or dinners; and commencement. The range of opportunities illustrates why the special events operation has attained a specific role of its own on many campuses, and the variety of occasions that can be sponsored to draw special attention to the institution.

Internal and external communications. Because communication with its external audiences occurs at every level of a college or university, the importance of communication seems self-evident. Yet too often, people within or around an institution are uninformed or misinformed (H. Rowland 1977). From experience, most managers know the damage to organ-

izational morale and credibility that can occur through misperceptions, misapprehensions, and misunderstandings—simple communication failures.

To colleges and universities dependent on public support and confidence, effective internal and external communication is critical and is perhaps the central obligation of institutional advancement. Effective publications policies and products create a favorable climate for understanding and supporting the institution and its goals. Informing students and faculty and cultivating alumni, legislators, donors, and the general public are not possible without specific communication objectives: to inform, influence attitudes, motivate behavior, and entertain (Rogers 1978). Institutional relationships that are mutually reinforcing and beneficial rely largely on effective methods of interpreting the institution to its publics.

Developing strategies for effective communication begins with clear statements of policy to govern the communication process. The president of the institution generally determines and codifies the policies from which programs or special communication campaigns are then created (Rogers 1978). Internal and external communication channels then become the normal avenues for transmitting messages about the institution to specific audiences and for gathering feedback.

Internal communication, by plan or by accident, has immense impact on institutional image and progress. When students, faculty, and staff are well informed about the institution, they can reinforce external messages about the institution. In effect, they become emissaries of good will to the publics outside the institution.

Achieving the desired positive impact is neither simple nor easy since today's colleges and universities are sophisticated, heterogeneous units unlike most other organizations (Radock 1971). Control of the message to be communicated is a matter of risk, not easily influenced. However, several techniques for internal communication work if they are predicated on planning and priorities so that the communication has a purpose. Howard Ray Rowland (1977) examined the use of internal newsletters that disseminate university-related information to all employees, magazines and newspapers that provide full texts of reports or speeches as well as policy announcements and job openings, mimeographed bulletins that share information in an inexpensive and informal format, and student newspapers that reach the largest internal audience.

Radock (1971) states that internal communication should: (1) disseminate work-related information such as that found in employee handbooks, staff directories, phone books, and wage and salary regulations; (2) develop morale through newsletters, lists of publications, events calendars, rap sessions, and open-door sessions with the president; (3) enlist support for participation in specific institutional activities, such as scholarship campaigns, alumni programs, community service projects, and legislative lobbying; and (4) respond to adverse reports about the institution in a careful and credible manner. These objectives of an internal communication program, whether disseminated through print or electronic media, through

meeting , or other means, have the objective of making the internal constituencies feel that their stake in the institution is important and that their morale and enthusiasm for the university and its mission are worth sharing beyond the boundaries of the campus.

Communication with the external publics of the college or university address widely divergent groups of people, at times overlapping with internal audiences. The publics include alumni, commuting students, future students, families of employees, business and community leaders, donors, parents of students, legislators, government agencies, other colleges and universities, and taxpayers (Rydell 1977). Communicating with these constituencies requires a blend of technique that, when managed effectively, establishes a dialogue that is credible, creative, and reliable—particularly in times of crisis.

Both indirect and direct techniques can successfully communicate with external audiences (DeSantis 1978). Indirect methods include relations with the news media fostered through press releases, press conferences, press kits, special broadcasts, and briefings and controlled media such as publications, audiovisual presentations, displays and exhibits, and telephone and public address systems. Direct methods, according to DeSantis, reinforce the positive impact of indirect methods and include the use of trustees or councils, speakers bureaus, special events, community orientations, campus tours, information centers, and communications with special publics such as legislators and parents. These techniques, some traditional, others developing, work best when used together, although some components may receive greater emphasis in the overall program than others.

In addition to directing internal and external communication, managers of institutional communication must evaluate the effectiveness of their systems. Communication audits (Goldhaber 1978), either formally structured like the comprehensive audits of the International Communications Association or customized studies of institutional communication programs, can reveal important management information on current practices for future programming.

Government relations. It is only natural for government to be interested in colleges and universities. The financial and regulatory presence in higher education of both state and federal governments, coupled with a dwindling standard of confidence in the value of a college diploma, have created a need on most campuses—and in Washington, for some universities—for a government relations function. Today it appears "no institutional jurisdiction is immune from public scrutiny" (Freelen 1980, p. 75). Public and independent institutions have recognized the need for a government liaison operation for the fundamental reason that "colleges and universities seek strong public understanding and substantial funding" (Crawford 1977, p. 343). The government relations arm of institutional advancement has the task of seeking federal funds and state appropriations for the institution and of promoting the confidence of elected officials in the

value of higher education. By cultivating legislators and opinion leaders, government relations officers enlist support for specific issues, influence state and national educational policy making, and seek public revenues to help meet rising costs.

On both the state and national levels, much is at stake for most institutions of higher learning. About $14 billion in federal monies flow to higher education each year through a myriad of programs. Millions of students receive federal aid for education. State appropriations for the support of colleges and universities during 1980-81 totaled nearly $21 billion, and state scholarships and grants will reach more than $912 million. The government relations task is to (1) grasp the workings of government that make these funds available, (2) understand what the programs do and how to submit proposals for funding, and (3) seek programs that have the most potential for the individual institution (Claire 1975).

Although government relations is a new advancement function, in the next 20 years it may become the most important area of institutional advancement. Competition for scarce resources among public and independent institutions and the need to articulate public understanding of the value of a college education place heavy responsibilities on government relations. Public estrangement and cynicism about higher education have made many educators defensive and have reaffirmed a need for clear communication with government on higher education's values, outcomes, and policy directions. For many colleges and universities these issues already have made government relations indispensable.

Vying for federal research dollars has become a competitive art among major research universities demanding considerable expertise in proposal writing and obliging universities to seek research dollars to augment strained budgets. Among state colleges and universities, the annual budget presentation and defense require an advancement professional well versed in the political and economic complexities of government, someone able to clearly express the needs and goals of the institution. Beeman's analysis of the issues confronting government relations in the future led to her conclusion that "education needs to take a more pro-active stand in relation to . . . government" (1978, p. 16). She and other government relations proponents (Crawford 1977, Freelen 1980) advocate a policy-formulating role for higher education, in contrast to a traditionally reactive role, through effective lobbying efforts.

In addition to financial support, legislators and other influential people need recurring cultivation of friendship and goodwill. One-time visits do not bring lasting support or understanding. A variety of contacts—social and informational—serve to give a "favorable impression of the institution and the general understanding of the contributions and problems of all higher education" (Odell 1972, p. 10).

Vickrey has argued strongly for purposeful contact programs that articulate the aims of the institution to legislators and bureaucrats and, in turn, keep the institution informed of government programs. His suggestions emphasize the need for substantive communications, including:

Monitoring government activity; organizing and implementing a communications program to initiate and respond to past and proposed government activity; involving appropriate internal and external groups and individuals in the monitoring, communications, and related program activities; and assessing the efforts and reporting on the results (1977, p. 352).

Vickrey goes on to elaborate on each of these activities and provides specific programming examples from various institutions. A special report in *Techniques* (June 1972) raises further issues of relating to state legislatures and federal agencies as well as understanding the appropriations process. Although it was published in 1972, the report remains quite current for advancement administrators and others who need to understand the consequences and scope of government relations.

Trends in Institutional Advancement

With the elements of advancement functioning to one degree or another on most campuses, the total institutional advancement program has a diversified operating base from which to seek understanding and support for the institution's objectives. Yet, as the institution and its environment change, so too must the advancement program. For example, the response to enrollment declines has produced programs encouraging alumni involvement in the recruiting and admissions process. This period of economic hardship and dwindling enrollments has produced a surge in advancement activity. Today when many colleges and universities are initiating or implementing programs for their improvement, or even survival, a number of advancement trends have emerged that may direct their future course.

Six patterns of management and programming have evolved from the literature and from the experiences of several hundred colleges and universities that have reported their approaches and practices in *CASE Currents* and other journals. They include an appeal for cooperation, the importance of the institution's president, the role of marketing, the process of evaluation, the growth of professionalism, and the surge of advancement activity. A. W. Rowland (1977), the Jossey-Bass series *New Directions for Institutional Advancement*, and principal spokesmen for advancement all cite and elaborate on these trends.

Trend One: Teamwork. There has been a steady movement toward coordination of the specialities that compose institutional advancement in the almost 25 years since the Greenbrier Conference. Before that time, institutional advancement elements operated on their own, with little integrated planning or programming. Alumni associations, particularly those financed and managed independent of their universities, had few occasions to correlate their purposes and activities with those of other advancement specialities. Government relations officers and fund raisers, information staffs and public relations personnel were all accustomed to

operating independently. There was no concept of institutional advancement as a coordinated program where the various functions were consolidated within the university for the accomplishment of specific objectives.

The Greenbrier Conference advocated an end to fractionalized organization. Since then, advancement personnel have widely accepted the need for the specialities to cooperate with more interaction, communication, and joint programming. In hard times, it has been even more important. In part, the merger in 1974 of the professional organizations, AAC and ACPRA, to form CASE was a recognition of joint purposes among practitioners of alumni relations, fund raising, and public relations. A similar awareness has permeated most campuses. Today it is usual for one senior administrator, generally a vice president reporting to the president, to oversee the elements of advancement, coordinating their purposes, counseling the president on policy, maximizing communication among the specialties and the institution, and improving programming. This organizational pattern, recently reaffirmed by a number of commentators (Beeman 1978, Corey 1966, Fisher 1980, Jacobson 1978b, A.W. Rowland 1977) has the advantage of reducing both costly inefficiencies and the limited perspective brought about by working in isolation. The central organization of advancement's elements encourages the specialties to interact, to channel their common purpose toward mutual goals.

The need for coordination on campus encompasses all internal constituencies of the institutions. In the *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*, A.W. Rowland offers an overview of key perspectives on institutional advancement. As a leading proponent of integrated advancement programs, he suggests that the entire institution should be concerned with advancement after the mission of the institution is clearly defined. In presenting his recommendations, A.W. Rowland notes: "Practically everything that happens at or to a college or university makes some contribution toward its reputation and its image, good or bad. Each action program, policy and performance becomes a part of the institution's total institutional advancement program" (1977, pp. 523-24). Faculty, students, researchers, and administrative and auxiliary staffs have a stake in an effective advancement program. Advancement is not the exclusive domain of a few administrators; the whole institution has an obligation to cultivate a climate that fosters understanding and support.

Beyond improving the effectiveness of advancement programs internally, the need to pull together has legitimate application in promoting higher education, influencing national policy, and building public confidence in higher learning. Because of their scope and perspective, advancement administrators are uniquely suited to speaking for higher education. Because they see the institution as a whole, they can work toward making the institution in particular more effective and higher education in general more accepted (A.W. Rowland 1977). The joint efforts of college and university advancement staffs and the professional associations of higher education are an effective combination to focus attention on social, fi-

nancial, and educational issues that affect higher education (Jacobson 1978b).

Although the appeal for teamwork has emerged as a principal trend in institutional advancement, it is not without difficulties that may contribute to a breakdown in cooperation. Cheshire (1980) notes that some presidents are disappointed with advancement, and he suggests several reasons why they should be disappointed. First, in historical terms, the field is new, somewhat unseasoned; second, the gap between responsibility and accountability creates inefficiencies and frustrations; third, some presidents may have unrealistic expectations of what advancement can achieve; fourth, the public mood, with which advancement administrators contend, is somewhat skeptical of education; and fifth, on many campuses advancement's professional role lacks clear definition. Operationally and organizationally the elements of advancement remain unrelated and uncommunicative at some institutions. Few would disagree with Cheshire that "these instances hurt institutional productivity and damage professional credibility in advancement" (1980, p. 17). Although economic hard times and declining enrollments may foster more cohesion, the problem of fragmentation will not be easily solved.

Trend Two: Presidential leadership. A second trend has been the recognition that the college or university president must be the mainspring of institutional advancement. As chief executive officer of the institution, the president has been responsible for public relations from the very beginning of American higher education. The earliest proponents of advancement (Fine 1951, p. 136; Persons 1946, pp. 3-4) have noted the president's obligation to set the tone, develop the strategies, and establish the priorities for institutional advancement. Presidents have become all the more important in today's advancement programs. The influence of mass media, coupled with hard times, makes it "no longer adequate merely to be a first rate institution. Now you have to be noticed as such, and that means having your president noticed" (Gehrung 1980, p. 12). Issues of *CASE Currents* (October 1977 and October 1980) have devoted special attention to the role of the president as the institution's public relations leader, and to the relationship between the advancement administrators and the president. Articles in both issues cite specific examples of a president's public relations function.

Unlike other management functions at the institution, advancement cannot be entirely delegated. The president forms the strategy, defines the roles, and is a vital part of the process. The president is "the center of the advancement effort: suggesting, critiquing, judging, challenging, and performing" (Cheshire 1980, p. 14). The president must be personally involved in relations with the media, government, alumni, and campus and general publics. He or she must articulate the mission of the institution, generate understanding and private support from alumni, and lead the fund raising effort from public sources. The president's role as an integral part of the advancement process creates the need for a special relationship with the

advancement staff. A smooth and successful program depends on a "special chemistry" among these key administrators. Many observers note that mutual respect, communication, cooperation, and trust are of vital importance in this relationship (Cheshire 1980, Fisher 1980, Gehrung 1980, Lavery 1980, A.W. Rowland 1977, Shea 1977). Rowland has further noted that "so central is the role of the president to the success or failure of an institutional advancement program that his or her lack of participation and support can negate any efforts made in this direction" (1977, p. 530).

Presidents themselves have come to recognize their central responsibility for advancement. The process, although slow in developing, now has become recognized as vital. In *Presidential Leadership in Advancement Activities*, James Fisher, president of CASE, cites several views on presidential responsibility and adds his own. He writes that the anxiety, suspicion, even disdain, some presidents have of advancement's elements is "understandable, but not acceptable. Unless presidents can learn how to relate to external audiences and how to oversee the staffing and organization of an effective advancement effort, their institutions will suffer" (1980, p. viii). He and the other contributors to this work examine presidential leadership techniques, and the cultivating of a working partnership for the "self renewal and self regulation" of higher education. Fisher's forthcoming book, *The Power of the Presidency*, extends his observations about presidential leadership and influence roles with on- and off-campus constituencies. His work on the relationships, tasks, and expectations of presidential leadership is a significant guide.

Trend Three: Marketing. A third trend has been the growing respectability of educational marketing as a component of a total advancement program. In its purposes and functions, effective advancement is roughly analogous to marketing. Almost every action common to advancement—defining objectives, planning, identifying publics, communicating, finding students and donors, predicting trends, and analyzing programs—is a marketing practice; yet advancement and its elements have their own peculiarities unique to higher education. In noting the similarities, many proponents of marketing in higher education (Barton 1978, Fram 1973, Kotler 1975, Krachenberg 1972, Litten 1980) suggest that a marketing plan is compatible with higher education and offers major benefits.

Proponents of a role for marketing cite many benefits for colleges and universities, most notably that marketing makes higher education more accountable. (Fram 1973, Litten 1980). The marketing focus on price, product, persuasion, and position provide a framework for analyzing how resources are used, what the strengths and limitations of various programs are, how demographic patterns and projections affect academic planning, and what effects of the educational process seem to be achieved. A marketing plan also offers the benefit of assessing expectations in the design and delivery of educational programs. Applied productively, a marketing methodology can preserve among external audiences the idea that a college education is something of value, thus building confidence in higher edu-

cation. The measurable results of marketing can prove the worth of higher education while providing substantial information for advancement administrators.

The May 1977 issue of *CASE Currents* focused on marketing and why institutions need it. The issue began with a clarification by Philip Kotler of what marketing is: "The analysis, planning, and control of programs designed to bring about desired exchanges with designated markets" (1977, p. 4). Kotler explained that educational marketing is not merchandising, advertising, or high-pressure selling, as its image suggests and as some in academia fear. Rather, it is concerned with "building satisfaction in a long-term clientele. It entails quite consciously doing a good job of consumer and market research, market definition and cultivation, product and service design and development, distribution, planning, pricing, and promotion" (1977, pp. 5-6). The issue examines approaches in educational marketing among the various elements of advancement, illustrating how colleges and universities have applied principles of marketing for their improvement.

The marketing trend must be developed carefully since it entails several risks. Perhaps the most obvious is the possible abuse of truth (Fiske 1979) through irresponsible application of marketing techniques. Litten (1980) noted seven other risks—spurious program development, hard-sell connotations, compromising standards of quality, cutthroat competition, suspicious terminology, pro-business bias, and ill-conceived programs based on a lack of understanding of higher education and marketing concepts—that have slowed the wide acceptance of educational marketing.

Economic realities, as well as an awareness of the benefits, have made marketing attractive to advancement administrators in an increasing number of institutions. In alumni relations and particularly in student recruitment, the use of marketing principles has gained rapid acceptance. CASE publications and conferences that focus on alumni or on student recruitment are based on a marketing premise. Other prominent publications on student recruitment also employ marketing principles as the basis for their recommendations (Carter and Garigan 1979; Ihlanfeldt 1980). The Jossey-Bass series, *New Directions for Institutional Research* summarized in a recent issue (Lucas 1979) the components of a complete marketing plan for higher education, outlining methodologies, probable audiences, and specific procedures. Community colleges have begun to implement such plans in order to assess their image, attract students, and provide useful services on limited resources (Eckert 1979, El Sharei 1979, Fast 1979, Fischer 1978). It remains to be seen to what extent four-year colleges and universities adopt similar marketing plans that address the major areas of the institution, but the framework for such plans—institutional advancement programs—is already in place.

Trend Four: Evaluation. The fourth trend concerns the evaluation process, which is directly linked with marketing and advancement programs. The public pressure for accountability in higher education has had a strong

impact on advancement administrators responsible for sponsoring efficient and productive programs. It has become necessary to demonstrate the results of advancement programs in order to justify and maintain them. This assessment of the productivity of advancement programs not only indicates current trends but also leads to innovations in the field.

Advancement operations were once thought to be too complicated to be judged by the evaluation process; the goodwill and understanding that they cultivate were not thought to be measurable. As in matters of curriculum and learning outcomes, however, new tools for measuring outcomes have begun to furnish "definitions of comparability and bases of standardization" (Jacobson 1978b, p. 6). Methods are now available to assess the elements of advancement and the total advancement program.

In *Evaluating Advancement Programs* (1978b), Jacobson suggests guidelines and raises issues for advancement administrators to consider as they initiate evaluation studies. He also provides six case studies to illustrate assessment methods at various institutions. Francis (1977) examines the most widely practiced tool of evaluation, the survey of constituencies. He and other authors in the volume review available survey methods, discuss their advantages and disadvantages, and present recommendations for successful survey research. Generally, approaches to the evaluation of advancement programs have applied techniques of empirical methodology common to social science research and business, but adapted to the university setting. Jacobson's model for evaluating advancement programs (1978b, pp. 17-63), for example, suggests productivity categories—effort, performance, and effects—with three to five quantifiable indicators for each category. His framework assumes explicit and specific goals in each advancement specialty, particular action steps toward the achievement of the goals, and detailed criteria for assessing effectiveness. Fund raising dollars (compared to potential), participation in alumni and public events, etc., can be specifically measured by particular outcomes, interviews, surveys, and information diaries. The cost analysis techniques of cost accounting and budgeting add another dimension to program measurement. Zero-based budgeting, program budgeting, and other budget analysis systems aid decision makers in determining priorities among programs as a function of costs. Jenny has suggested that in addition to analyzing cost effectiveness through one procedure or another, advancement administrators ought to compare planned goals with actual results in a "performance accounting" (1977, p. 506), a process similar to Jacobson's.

The value of assessment is that comparisons can be made, both within and outside the institution. Major studies across institutions—*Seeking the Competive Dollar: College Management in the Seventies* (Leslie 1971), *Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study in College Management* (Leslie 1969), "Output = Input? (Bacon and Leslie 1970), "Trends in Campus Advancement" (Bacon and Pride 1971), *Alumni Administration at State Colleges and Universities* (Blakely 1979)—have done more than analyze expenditures, study attitudes, and compare trends. They have defined measurement indicators that best reflect productivity (e.g., gift income as the best cor-

relator in assessing fund raising costs), professional trends in the advancement field (e.g., operating status of alumni associations and types of advancement specialties under the advancement umbrella), and, more importantly over the long term, provided a baseline for analyzing the results of future investigations.

Today, there are measurement structures and experiences available from several sources (A.W. Rowland 1977; *CASE Currents; New Directions for Institutional Advancement*) that outline the practice and theory of managing advancement programs on a research base. For the most part, the results of evaluation suggest that institutional advancement programs make distinct and measurable contributions to higher education.

Trend Five: Professionalism. A fifth trend is the focus on professionalism. The growing emphasis on advancement activity and results is placing new stress on practitioners. There is an increasing awareness among those in the advancement field of the need for greater professionalism, more career development, and a total immersion in the academic milieu. Advancement officers "must be perceived as educators, and they must perceive themselves as such" (Fisher 1980, p. 86). Many advancement administrators feel that their position is not well defined. Perhaps this stems from advancement's record of independent action, and from the fact that their functions have been considered suspect by many administrators and faculty. Acceptance of advancement programs in the campus community, a vital matter in hard times, depends on the qualifications of advancement personnel and on how academic colleagues feel about those officers (A.W. Rowland 1977). Moving from the periphery of administration to the educational center of the institution is important to the identity and success of advancement programs. More importantly, it is indispensable to the prosperity and progress of higher education. Key proponents of professionalism (Born 1979, Fisher 1980, A.W. Rowland 1977) have underscored the fact that education is the business of advancement, and that advancement administrators must be conversant, familiar, and trained in the milieu of higher education.

In presenting his endorsement of professionalism, A.W. Rowland states: "The institutional advancement officer must be concerned about his or her own academic qualifications first and about his or her professional institutional advancement skills second. Institutional advancement officers must be concerned about professionalism" (1977, pp. 533-34). Fisher writes that advancement administrators "must be so wise and loyal that in times of difficulty the president will go to them, not out of courtesy, but because he or she values and respects their judgment" (1980, p. 90). Helping advancement officers achieve this goal has been a major theme at CASE, where seminars, conferences, summer institutes, and publications have been directed toward improving qualifications and skills. Aside from providing information helpful to the specialities, CASE has offered guidelines for professional improvement, detailing trends and issues in higher education, outlining expectations and goals, and recommending

standards of performance for all advancement officers. As a professional association, it has taken the lead in designing programming to strengthen the talents of its members.

New emphasis has been placed on the manner advancement operates on campus and on the necessity for a high level of expertise. More than ever before competency is measured by results. Advancement administration today requires a knowledge of management by objectives, zero-based budgeting, program accountability, evaluation and research, program budgeting, specialty audits, and other applications of contemporary management techniques. These skills are in addition to those abilities practitioners must already have in their given specialties. Management skills are important for alumni administrators, fund raisers, and public relations officers, and they must be kept current through practice and continuing education. Proponents of professionalism have long advocated a program of professional development for advancement officers, blending academic programs with conferences sponsored by higher education associations and leading to nondegree certificates (Born 1979). Professional journals and books are also recommended to sustain levels of performance in advancement and foster improvements.

Trend Six: Increasing levels of advancement activity. A final trend in institutional advancement has been the surge in advancement activity that has brought changes to many colleges and universities and encouraged new sensitivity to constituent groups and advancement programs. Hard times have precipitated much of this activity. The competition for students and donors, as well as the defensive posture in which higher education finds itself, have brought new obligations to advancement (Cheshire 1980). Today university officials have become more alert to the need for good public relations and are much more aggressive about image building and protecting. In the "golden years" of higher education when students and funds were generally plentiful, advancement played a rather passive role; today it has become active. Radock (1980) has advised that the advancement officer should play a key role in the decisions made by colleges and universities in the '80s.

In explaining the surge in advancement, Fisher (1979) claims that the advancement function "should be to dramatize issues, highlight accomplishment, and generally enhance the public estimate of quality education" (p. 7). Today's climate has necessitated a new responsiveness from advancement. In a similar vein, Beeman (1975) writes that colleges and universities demonstrate their "right to survive by the integrity of [their] educational and research programs and by the services [they] render students and alumni and the society of which they are a part" (p. 5). Advancement programs must contribute to these objectives if they are to contribute to the improvement of institutions and of higher education.

Indicators of the surge in advancement activity emerge from the cross-institutional research. A large majority of colleges and universities have a central manager, generally a vice president, directing their advancement

programs. Nearly every institution today includes the advancement function in policy making. More advancement administrators have earned advanced degrees and hold faculty status. Salaries also have risen. It is not unusual for experienced advancement officers to earn $30,000, $40,000, even $60,000, although a salary of about $35,000 is average for vice presidents (Carson and Wegner 1980, Radock 1980). The mass media are paying increased attention to colleges and universities. National magazines frequently carry advertisements placed by universities, public service announcements on radio and TV disseminate information advancement officers have planned and produced, and news releases report the latest in research and service. Serving the mass media and encouraging its coverage have in fact been a principal orientation of many advancement programs (Bacon and Pride 1971).

In summary, institutional advancement has an important commitment to higher education and the welfare of the institution that goes far beyond polishing the institutional image. Its various elements spell out advancement's objectives through programming designed to attract the diverse publics of the institution and cultivate their understanding. Hard times have strengthened advancement by clarifying its role and by encouraging it to operate productively according to standards of credibility and integrity. It is too soon to tell whether its elements will coalesce into a function for the comprehensive marketing and management of constituencies or whether the specialties will remain centrally administered and decentrally operated.

Strategies for Institutional Advancement

Institutional advancement relies on effective management for its direction and success. The choices facing higher education have significant implications for managers and make their own demands on advancement programs. Current issues of public lack of confidence in higher education, enrollment patterns and projections, financing, and government remain directly tied to advancement. The following discussion examines approaches for present effective advancement programs and the outlook for the future. It briefly reviews the climate in higher education that necessitates effective management of advancement and suggests four strategies and four challenges for administrators.

The Present Climate

The condition of higher education today and the outlook for the near future have been the subject of considerable hand-wringing and despair that may not be entirely justified. The Carnegie Council has projected a 5 to 15 percent enrollment decline among the 18- to 22-year-old students that colleges have traditionally attracted (Carnegie 1980). At the same time, there has been a marked increase in the number of older students enrolling in higher education, and there is a possibility of further increases. The Carnegie analysis states that public confidence in colleges and universities has been rebounding over the past few years, although it remains an issue of continuing importance. Aside from surveys cited by the Carnegie report, the best evidence of that confidence is the public's willingness to fund higher learning. Despite inflation, revenues for higher education have held relatively steady and are projected to retain their 2.1 percent share of the GNP. At the same time, tight finances are inhibiting operations at individual institutions, resulting in reductions and retrenchment. Overall, however, the present climate indicates substantial strength for higher education; conditions may be better than academic forecasters have observed.

The present climate for higher education is not without its hard choices as the last Carnegie Council report, *Three Thousand Futures* (1980) makes clear. The report suggests that the agenda for colleges and universities is being set by students and is constricted by government regulations. Significantly, too, these choices impinge on the operations of advancement programs. Government funding for and regulation of colleges and universities create added pressures on government relations offices. Dependence on public sources of funding brings greater reliance on fund raising operations, government relations, and alumni relations. The need to increase public confidence and to respond to the pressures of students requires broad responses in communication and in university-wide relationships. Decisions about quality, integrity, change that is compatible with the internal and external publics of the institution, effective use of resources, financing and philanthropy, and leadership are the legitimate concern of advancement and involve the entire academic community. The "working combination of interests" of diverse constituencies must define the base from which advancement policies and programs are approached in the present climate.

Four Strategies and Four Challenges for the Future

Most published accounts of advancement strategies focus on approaches that are quite properly the responsibility of management and leadership. Clearly, advancement is a leadership responsibility. That is why understanding its traditions, character, and potential becomes vital to its success and to the success of the institution. College and university management—particularly the president—is responsible for giving a sense of direction to advancement programs. This is especially important in hard times.

Resources are a major concern of advancement: acquiring, interpreting, and maintaining them for the benefit of the institution. Cheshire (1980) described this approach as the stewardship of people, time, space, and money. The purpose of advancement then becomes "the deployment of faculty and students, the husbanding of campus facilities and services, and the acquisition of new resources" (1980, p. 10). Both tangible and intangible resources are the responsibility of advancement officers. Community friendships, good will, and service would share importance with money raised and buildings constructed.

The management practices common to the business world would administer the advancement program in terms of people, time, space and money. Efficiency measures, cost/benefit analysis, and general management principles would be incorporated into campus administration. Areas of responsibility would be clearly delineated, lines of communication would be tightened, and operations research would evaluate the total enterprise. Such management procedures are likely to inhibit wide acceptance of the resources approach, although components of the approach are found on many campuses.

Building the advancement program around the prestige of the institution is a second strategy. Conceivably, the reputation of an institution can see it through competitive times (Cheshire 1980). A strong reputation creates its own climate for understanding and support. The institution's image attracts students and donors, fosters a base of support, enables the advancement officers to make friends and cultivate influential opinion leaders. The prestige of the college or university also determines its financial situation, including the funding support that can be obtained (Cheshire 1980). Under such a strategy, the objectives of advancement would center on preserving an untarnished image and nurturing a strong academic reputation. Programming would likely stress exclusivity as the key to public acceptance.

An administrative pattern designed to sustain the prestige of the institution would, its proponents claim, encourage advancement officers to operate at maximum effectiveness in harmony with the mission of the institution. Once objectives were established, advancement programs, consistent with those objectives, would respond to constituencies as a function of prestige, although such an approach is not universal in its applications. The tenuous nature of prestige is unlikely to make it the primary touchstone of advancement although it plays a major role in the expectations of many current advancement programs.

The third strategy for institutional advancement is marketing. Marketing is a pragmatic approach to advancing colleges and universities in competitive times. It is dynamic and compatible with the elements of advancement that already operate on most campuses. Although suspicions linger about it in higher education, marketing has an effective track record in business, and has made meaningful contributions to the success of colleges and universities. Ivens (1977) sees marketing as the answer to the question of institutional survival. He notes "the ability to identify markets and to communicate effectively with people in these markets are your tickets to survival" (1977, p. 10). In a similar vein, Fram (1979) advocates the value of a marketing viewpoint with the president of the institution as leader and coordinator. He believes that the market potential of many institutions fails to develop because presidents mistake insular components of advancement for a total marketing plan. He appeals for a broad perspective that considers current and future growth, the climate for higher education, and the objectives of the institution.

As a strategy for managing colleges and universities in hard times, marketing is cited as a serious approach that can produce consistent, purposeful programming and that stresses academic ideas rather than institutional needs (Fisher 1979). The identification and involvement of an institution's various publics (a traditional focus for advancement) are systematically pursued and evaluated for program planning. Fund raising, government relations, and alumni programming are all compatible with marketing. Marketing as an advancement strategy correlates programs and activities not only for resource efficiency but for contact and management efficiency as well.

As the literature indicates, marketing has its risks; a dubious image may hinder its wide acceptance in academia. As a result, the fourth strategy may have more appeal. Applying concepts outlined by Leslie (1971), a "flexible management" approach addresses the functions of advancement systematically, based on institutional objectives and eclectic viewpoints. Its major premise is that the total advancement program succeeds best when managed with central, unified leadership and planning and programming pull together to achieve broad objectives. It is based on the recommendations of several proponents (Leslie 1971, Kidera 1968, Fisher 1980) who have called for a careful assessment to revitalize advancement programs for competitive times, and most importantly, for central, presidential leadership. Ten years after the Greenbrier Report, Kidera (1968), for example, argued that the report's recommendation for a "coordinator of functions" was inadequate since it was insufficiently positioned in the institutional hierarchy to give strong leadership and to plan a unified strategy. Over the past decade, most institutions have sensed this fact and organized their advancement functions for tighter management. In many cases, however, institutions have stopped there, failing to delegate the authority as well as the responsibility for advancement programming.

Although presidential leadership is the key to flexible management, advancement officers must adapt practices of modern management to

their operations. Historical approaches to attract students and donors and involve alumni and friends need review. The number of changes in the status of many colleges and universities—closures and mergers—as well as serious concerns for the financial well being of other institutions indicate that perhaps the historical approaches are not succeeding in more competitive times. Leslie (1971) suggests that institutions analyze their present management procedures and then develop pragmatic techniques "that will enable them to acquire the increasingly competitive dollar regardless of what financial climate they may face" (1971, p. 5). Leslie goes on to emphasize that all segments of the advancement program can be directed toward specific and unified purposes with "flexible management":

> *Public relations programs must be planned in relation to the legislative (federal and state) climate, student recruitment requirements, property acquisition, labor union relations, private gift activities, and scores of other ever-changing conditions. Alumni programs in many institutions will have to be reassessed with tangible objectives established in line with institutional goals (1971, p. 5).*

Included in the "flexible management" approach are such techniques as management by objective, program budgeting, cost accounting, and marketing concepts. The process must remain flexible with the capacity to revise procedures or eliminate programs based on program evaluations and changing objectives. Limitations to the "flexible management" approach are "academic traditionalism, responsibility without commensurate authority, inadequate governing boards, and untrained leadership" (Leslie 1971, p. 8). These administrative limitations as well as local issues, may inhibit acceptance of this approach.

Managing for the competitive dollar and student in the decade ahead confronts four challenges that will test the best advancement strategy. The first is to design quality public relations programs that will build influence and support for the institution. External pressure and esteem within the profession of educational advancement require public relations programs that meet high standards of accuracy and graphic presentation. Staying alert for programs that cultivate influence among various publics places significant demands on advancement administrators.

The second challenge is to restructure institutional activities to involve the greatest possible number of constituents. Traditional activities may not maintain the publics' interest. Alumni want meaningful, not superficial, involvement; donors want to support ideas and lasting objectives. Making provisions for programs that encourage involvement and also enhance the objectives of the institution will be a considerable task.

The third challenge is to design fund raising campaigns that achieve optimum results within the constraints of competition, inflation, and tax law and that are cost effective. The key to this challenge is the evaluation of the costs of fund raising. How much do current fund raising programs cost? How productive are the programs? The answers to these and related

questions could reshape fund raising programs at many colleges and universities, resulting perhaps in a unified major campaign or additional stress on deferred giving. Inflation and tax laws that discourage giving further complicate the process.

A final challenge for advancement administrators is to coordinate objectives, programs, resources, and contacts for maximum effectiveness. Coordinated programs are essential for efficient advancement of an institution's opportunities and services. Central management of institutional advancement does not hinder the diversity of higher education but is one of its great strengths. Indeed, the failure to unite may well obstruct that diversity. Hard times oblige advancement officers to correlate their purposes and coordinate their programs both within and outside the campus community.

The conditions of higher education suggest that a viewpoint for implementing advancement programs in hard times is definitely needed. The several approaches to advancement indicate that its diverse elements are manageable under a unifying philosophy that considers the dynamics of the institution and best advances it. The success of colleges and universities may well depend on an advancement strategy that promotes both the institution and higher education. Fisher has concluded:

> *Those [colleges] that do not prosper [in the 1980's] will be those that have not placed honest and bold emphasis on their educational programs and on their management designs. They will not have realistically involved faculty, students, and trustees in accomplishing the goals of the institution; they will have depended on sporadic efforts in government relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and public affairs instead of on a continuous development program that emphasized educational ideas rather than institutional needs; and they will be led by presidents who are neither bold nor enlightened and who spend more time lamenting than progressing. (1980, pp. 84-85)*

The task in the decade ahead for all advancement personnel will be to participate in and, perhaps, lead a program based on research that applies systematic management and, with a coordinated approach, builds needed understanding and support for their institutions.

Bibliography

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institute of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education*. Most of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). For publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS, ordering number and price are included. Readers who wish to order a publication should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the document number. Documents are available as noted in microfiche (MF) and paper copy (PC).

Aikman, Patrick. "Is Your Path to Goodwill an Obstacle Course?" *CASE Currents* 4 (May 1978): 46.

American College Public Relations Association. *The Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: ACPRA, 1958.

——— *Casebook of Institutional Advancement Programs*. Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: ACPRA, 1972.

Bacon, Annette L. and Leslie, John W. "Output = Input?" *College and University Journal* 9 (Fall 1970): 5-9.

Bacon, Annette L. and Pride, Cletis. "Trends in Campus Advancement." *College and University Journal* 10 (March 1971): 9-12.

Barcus, F. Earle *Alumni Administration*. Washington, D.C.: American Alumni Council, 1968.

Barton, David W., Jr., ed. *Marketing Higher Education*. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Beeman, Alice L. "Promises to Keep." *CASE Currents* 1 (September 1975): 4-5.

———. "Shaping and Surveying Trends." *CASE Currents* 4 (July 1978): 15-16.

Bender, Louis W. and Wygal, Benjamin R. *Improving Relations with the Public*. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Berger, Joel S. *Making Your News Service More Effective*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1978. ED 184 496. MF-$1.06. PC not available from EDRS.

Bishop, Robert L. *Public Relations: A Comprehensive Bibliography*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1974.

Blakely, B. E. *Alumni Administration at State Colleges and Universities*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1979. ED 175 308 MF-$1.06. PC not available from EDRS.

Blumenthal, L. Roy. *The Practice of Public Relations*. New York: MacMillan and Co., 1972.

Born, W. Michael. "Light Up Your Career. A Guide to Further Study in Institutional Advancement." *CASE Currents* 5 (July 1979): 29-30.

Budd, John F., Jr. *An Executive's Primer on Public Relations*. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1969.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Three Thousand Futures. The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Carson, Mary B. and Wegner, Nona B. "Here's Looking at You. A Job Survey Focusing on CASE Members." *CASE Currents* 6 (July 1980): 20-22.

Carter, Virginia L. and Garigan, Catherine S., eds. *CASE: A Marketing Approach to Student Recruitment. The Best of CASE Currents*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1979. ED 177 930. MF-$1.06. PC not available from EDRS.

Cheshire, Richard D. "The State of the Art." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

———. "Whither the Capital Campaign?" *CASE Currents* 5 (March 1979): 6-10.

———. "Strategies for Advancement." *Presidential Leadership in Advancement Activities*. Edited by James L. Fisher. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 8. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Cievo, Arthur V. "Cutting PR/Relations Cost." *CASE Currents* 1 (September 1975): 30-35.

Claire, William. "Starting A Government Relations Program." *CASE Currents* 1 (December 1975): 10-11.

"Comparative Study of Development and University Relations at Twenty-Five Colleges and Universities." Washington, D.C.: Consortium on Financing Higher Education, 1976. Mimeographed.

Connors, Tracy Daniel, ed. *The Nonprofit Organization Handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Corey, John. "The Organization of a College or University Public Affairs Program." *College and University Journal* 5 (Spring 1966): 44-48.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. *Voluntary Support of Higher Education, 1978-79*. New York: Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1980.

Crawford, Edwin M. "Government Relations: An Overview." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Cutlip, Scott M. and Center, Allen H. *Effective Public Relations*. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Davidson, Robert C. "The Growth of College Public Relations." *College Public Relations Quarterly* 7 (July 1956): 15-19.

DeSantis, James R. "Evaluating External Communications." *Improving Institutional Communication*. Edited by Gerald M. Goldhaber. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

DioGuardi, Joseph J. "Tax-Exempt Organizations in a Technical Perspective." *The Nonprofit Organization Handbook*. Edited by Tracy Daniel Connors. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Dueitt, Bertie Sue. "American Higher Education Alumni Programs—A Goals Analysis." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alabama, 1975.

Eckert, Miles A. "The Marketing Process at Odessa College." Paper presented at the 59th Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Chicago, Ill., April 29-May 2, 1979. ED 169 982. MF-$1.06; PC-$3.40.

Ehling, William P. "Publicity in Higher Education: A Problem in Administration." *College Public Relations Quarterly* 4 (January 1953): 9-15.

El Sharei, Patricia P. "Implementing a Marketing Program in the Community College." Seminar paper presented at Pepperdine University, Malibu, Calif., January 1979. ED 164 075. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.

Ellis, George Edward. *The Harvard Memorial*. Cambridge, Mass.: John Wilson and Son, 1884.

Emerson, Richard. "The Effective Alumni Association." *CASE Currents* 5 (May 1979): 54.

Fast, Casey. "Educational Marketing Methods at Lane Community College." Paper presented at the Coping With Decline Conference, St. Louis, Mo., March 5, 1979. ED 168 653. MF-$1.06; PC-$3.40.

Fidler, William P. "Faculty Responsibility in Institutional Public Relations." *Pride* 4 (September 1960): 5-7.

Filer Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. *Giving in America: Towards a Stronger Voluntary Sector*. Washington, D.C.: Filer Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, 1975.

Fine, Benjamin. *College Publicity in the United States.* New York: Columbia University, 1951.

Fink, Norman S. "Philanthropy and Tax Reform." *CASE Currents* 2 (April 1976): 34-36.

Fischer, Guerin A. "Marketing a Community College: A Conceptual Framework." Paper presented at the 58th convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Atlanta, Ga., April 9-12, 1978. ED 156 280. MF-$1.06; PC-$3.40.

Fisher, James L. "CASE: A New Era." *CASE Currents* 5 (April 1979): 6-10.

———., ed. *Presidential Leadership in Advancement Activities.* New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 8. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Fiske, Edward B. "The Marketing of the College." *Atlantic*, October 1979, pp. 93-98.

Forman, Robert G. "A-L-U-M-N-I Doesn't Just Spell M-O-N-E-Y." *CASE Currents* 4 (October 1978): 16-18.

———. "Alumni Relations Moving Into Mainstream." *CASE Currents* 5 (May 1979): 6-9.

———. "The Potential in Alumni Stewardship." *Presidential Leadership in Advancement Activities.* Edited by James L. Fisher. New Directions for Institutional Advancement No. 8. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Fram, Eugene H. "Marketing Higher Education." *The Future in the Making.* Edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. Current Issues in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

———. "Marketing Revisited: Clarifying Concepts and Strategies." *College Board Review* 94 (Winter 1974-75): 6-8, 22.

———. "The Marketing Role of the College or University President." Paper presented at the 19th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, San Diego, Calif., May 13-17, 1979. ED 174 124. MF-$1.06; PC-$3.40.

Francis, J. Bruce, ed. *Surveying Institutional Constituencies.* New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Freelen, Robert E. "Tasks in Government Relations." *Presidential Leadership in Advancement Activities.* Edited by James L. Fisher. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 8. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Freyd, William. "Requirements for Successful Fund Raising." *The Nonprofit Organization Handbook.* Edited by Tracy Daniel Connors. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Gehrung, Fred. "The Public Perception." *College and University Journal* 11 (November 1972): 23-24.

———. "The PR Pro's Roadtest." *CASE Currents* 6 (October 1980): 8-12.

Goldhaber, Gerald M., ed. *Improving Institutional Communication.* New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Gould, Samuel K. "Temptations in College PR." *College and University Journal* 6 (Spring 1967): 10-15.

Grunig, John E. "Measuring the Effectiveness of Public Relations." *Public Relations Review* 3 (April 1977): 5-10.

Harding, Harold R., ed. *Alumni Program Handbook.* Washington, D.C.: American Alumni Council, 1962.

Heeman, Warren, ed. *Analyzing the Cost Effectiveness of Fund-Raising.* New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Hesse, Robert R. "Ivory Tower or Public Trust." *College and University Journal* 12 (September 1973): 19-21.

———. ed. "Evaluation." *Techniques* 9 (June-July 1974): 11-17.

Hopkins, Everett H. "A Philosophy of Institutional Advancement." *College and University Journal* 1 (Winter 1962): 3-10.

Hunter, Peter F. "Shaping a Long-Range Plan for the Alumni Associations." *CASE Currents* 5 (October 1979): 40-42.

Ihlanfeldt, William. *Achieving Optimal Enrollments and Tuition Revenues*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Ivens, Stephen H. "Strategy for Survival." *CASE Currents* 3 (March 1977): 8-10.

Jacobson, Harvey K. "Know Thyself Program Evaluation in University Relations Development." *CASE Currents* 1 (November 1975): 7-9.

———. "The Role of Evaluation and Research in Management." In *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*, edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

———. "Seven Ways to Improve our Accountability." *CASE Currents* 4 (January 1978a): 4-6.

———, ed. *Evaluating Advancement Programs*. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978b.

Jenny, Hans H. "The Management of Resources." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Johnson, John G. "Is Bedrock Firm?" *CASE Currents* 2 (November 1976): 8-10.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Kidera, Robert A. "Unified Strategy and Command." *College and University Journal* 7 (Spring 1968): 3-5.

Kinnison, William. "The President as PR Boss." *CASE Currents* 3 (October 1977): 3-6.

Knowles, Asa S. *Handbook of College and University Administration*. Vol. 1 General. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

———, gen. ed. *International Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. 10 vols. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Kobre, Sidney. *Successful Public Relations for Colleges and Universities*. New York: Hasting House, 1974.

Kotler, Philip. *Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

———: "Why We Need Marketing." Interview. *CASE Currents* 3 (May 1977): 4-9.

Krachenberg, A. R. "Bring the Concept of Marketing to Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education* 43 (July 1972): 369-80.

Lavery, William E. "Marshaling the Alumni." *Educational Record* 61 (Fall 1980): 32-36.

Leslie, John W. *Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study in College Management*. Washington, D.C.: American College Public Relations Association, 1969.

———. "A Resource Allocation Information System for Managing an Institutional Advancement Program." *College and University Journal* 12 (May 1973) 19-29.

———. "Selected Indicators Chart Trends." *Evaluating Advancement Programs*. Edited by Harvey K. Jacobson. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978b.

———. "Variations in Fund-Raising Potential Among Colleges and Universities." *Analyzing the Cost Effectiveness of Fund-Raising*. Edited by Warren Heeman. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

———, ed. "Seeking the Competitive Dollar: College Management in the Seventies." *College and University Journal* 10 (November 1971): 3-56.

Lesly, Phillip, ed. *Public Relations Handbook*. Rev. ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Litten, Larry H. "Marketing Higher Education. Benefits and Risks for the American Academic System." *Journal of Higher Education* 51 (January-February 1980): 49-50.

Lockwood, Mary Ann. "Employee Survey Raises the Campus Consciousness." *CASE Currents* 3 (November 1977): 13-16.

Lucas, John A., ed. *Developing a Total Marketing Plan*. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Maxwell, Howard B. "The Formative Years of the University Alumni Movement as Illustrated by Studies of the University of Michigan and Columbia, Princeton, and Yale Universities, 1854-1918." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1965.

McCutcheon, Stephen C. "Principles of Public Relations." *College and University Journal* 12 (January 1973): 9-13.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Founding of Harvard College*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Muller, Steven. "Prologue: The Definition and Philosophy of Institutional Advancement." In *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Nolte, Lawrence. *Fundamentals of Public Relations*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1979.

Odell, Morgan. "The Emerging Profession." *Techniques* 7 (June 1972): 10-12.

Persons, Christopher E. *Public Relations for Colleges and Universities, A Manual of Practical Procedures*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1946.

Radock, Michael. "Public Relations for Educational Institutions." *Public Relations Handbook*, rev. ed. Edited by Phillip Lesly. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

———. "Impelling Imperatives for the 80's." Speech delivered at the 1980 Annual Assembly of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Detroit, Mich., July 8, 1980.

Ramsden, Richard J. "The COFHE Development Study: Insights and Implications." *Analyzing the Cost Effectiveness of Fund-Raising*. Edited by Warren Heeman. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Reck, W. Emerson. *Public Relations: A Program for Colleges and Universities*. New York: Harper and Row, 1946.

———. The Changing World of College Public Relations. History and Philosophy 1917-1975. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1976. ED 130 577. MF-$1.06; PC not available from EDRS.

———, ed. *College Publicity Manual*. New York: Harper and Row, 1948.

Reichley, Robert A. "Part Three: Alumni Administration." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Rogers, Donald P. "Effective Institutional Communication." *Improving Institutional Communication*. Edited by Gerald M. Goldhaber. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Rowland, A. Westley. "The Advancement of Higher Education." *College Publications Quarterly* 7 (January 1956): 5-10.

———. "The Management of the Institutional Advancement Program." *College and University Journal* 13 (March 1974): 4-12.

———. "Introduction to the Series: An Overview." *Evaluating Advancement Pro-*

grams. Edited by Harvey K. Jacobson. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

———, ed. *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Rowland, Howard Ray. "Internal Relations." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University, A History*. New York: Vintage, 1962.

Rydar, Kathleen. "Special Events." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Rydell, Ernest E. "External Relations." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Schoenfeld, Clarence. *The University and its Publics*. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Seiple, Colette. "Behind the Crystal Eightball." *CASE Currents* 4 (July 1978): 17-19.

Seller, Charles. "The History of ACPRA: 1915-1950." *College and University Journal* 1 (Spring 1962): 43-48.

Seymour, Harold. *Designs for Fund Raising*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Shea, James M. "Organization and Structure." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Sherratt Gerald R. "A Study of the Methods and Techniques Used in Fund-Raising at Selected Public Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1975.

Smallwood, S. J. and Levis, W. C. "First Draft: Model for Financial Reporting of Fund-Raising Activities." *Philanthropy Monthly* 10 (October 1977): 8-28.

Smith, G. T. "The Development Program." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Smith, Hayden W. "Voluntary Support: The End Product of Fund-Raising Activities." *Analyzing the Cost Effectiveness of Fund-Raising*. Edited by Warren Heeman. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Steinberg, Charles. "Public Relations on the Campus." *Journal of Higher Education* 39 (March 1969): 129-136.

Stephenson, Howard, ed. *Handbook of Public Relations*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Teitelbaum, Robert D. "How to Find Out What It's Really Costing You to Operate All These Fund-Raising Programs." *Analyzing the Cost Effectiveness of Fund-Raising*. Edited by Warren Heeman. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Tucker, John M. "Coping with the Squeeze of the New Sellers Market." *Management Controls* 24 (September-October 1977): 4-7.

Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Vickrey, James F., Jr., "Principles for Effective Government Relations." *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*. Edited by A. Westley Rowland. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Welch, Patricia, ed. *Increasing Annual Giving*. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Winkler, H. Donald. "Cultivating Your Backyard." *CASE Currents* 4 (May 1978): 8-11.

AAHE-ERIC Research Reports

Ten monographs in the AAHE-ERIC Research Report series are published each year, available individually or by subscription. Prices for single copies are listed below. Orders for 25 or more of a single title are eligible for a bulk discount. For orders under $15 add 15% postage/handling fee. All orders under $15 must be prepaid. Subscription to ten issues (beginning with date of subscription is $30 for members of AAHE, $45 for nonmembers, add $5 for subscriptions outside the U.S.

Order from Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036; 202/293-6440. Write or phone for a complete list of Research Reports and other AAHE publications.

1981 Research Reports—*AAHE members, $4 each; nonmembers, $5.50 each*

1. Minority Access to Higher Education
   Jean L. Preer
2. Institutional Advancement Strategies in Hard Times
   Michael D. Richards and Gerald R. Sherratt
3. Functional Literacy in the College Setting
   Richard C. Richardson Jr., Kathryn J. Martens, and Elizabeth C. Fisk

Other titles in the 1981 series to be announced.

1980 Research Reports—*AAHE members, $3 each; nonmembers, $4 each*

1. Federal Influence on Higher Education Curricula
   William V. Mayville
2. Program Evaluation
   Charles E. Feasley
3. Liberal Education in Transition
   Clifton C. Conrad and Jean C. Wyer
4. Adult Development: Implications for Higher Education
   Rita Preszler Weathersby and Jill Mattuck Tarule
5. A Question of Quality: The Higher Education Ratings Game
   Judith K. Lawrence and Kenneth C. Green
6. Accreditation: History, Process, and Problems
   Fred F. Harcleroad
7. Politics of Higher Education
   Edward R. Hines and Leif S. Hartmark
8. Student Retention Strategies
   Oscar T. Lenning, Ken Sauer, and Philip E. Beal
9. The Financing of Public Higher Education: Low Tuition, Student Aid, and the Federal Government
   Jacob Stampen
10. University Reform: An International Review
    Philip G. Altbach

1979 Research Reports—*AAHE members, $3 each; nonmembers, $4 each*

1. Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality
   Judith Gappa and Barbara Uehling
2. Old Expectations, New Realities: The Academic Profession Revisited
   Carol Herrnstadt Shulman
3. Budgeting in Higher Education
   J. Kent Caruthers and Melvin Orwig
4. The Three "R's" of the Eighties: Reducation, Retrenchment, and Reallocation
   Kenneth P. Mortimer and Michael L. Tierney
5. Occupational Programs in Four-Year Colleges: Trends and Issues
   Dale F. Campbell and Andrew F. Korim
6. Evaluation and Development of Administrators
   Robert C. Nordvall
7. Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties
   Thomas J. Grites
8. Professional Evaluation in the Eighties: Challenges and Response
   Glenn F. Nyre and Kathryn C. Reilly
9. Adult Baccalaureate Programs
   Marilou Denbo Eldred and Catherine Marienau
10. Survival Through Interdependence: Assessing the Costs and Benefits of Interinstitutional Cooperation
    Lewis D. Patterson